This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per. 971 e. 126/24

L4

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

Πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.—*Matt.* xvi. 18.

BIBLIOTHECA · PUBLICA · CONVELLI

VOL. XXIV.

LONDON:

WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, STRAND;

AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

MDCCCXLVIII.

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE.

I. RECIPROCAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE CHURCH AND THE CIVIL POWER.

Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power. By the Rev. J. L. Ross, M.A. 1

II. THE MINISTRY OF THE BODY.

The Ministry of the Body. By the Rev. Robert Wilson Evans, B.D., Vicar of Heversham, Westmoreland, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Author of "The Rectory of Valehead," &c. . . 25

III. FRANCE AND ITS REVOLUTIONS.

Memoires Relatifs a l'Histoire de France, pendant le 18mo. Siecle. 49

IV. OLIVER GOLDSMITH AND GERALD GRIFFIN.

1. The Life and Adventures of Oliver Goldsmith. A Biography in Four Books. By John Forster.
2. The Life of Gerald Griffin, Esq. By his Brother, Daniel Griffin, M.D. 75

V. THE STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE WITH THEIR RULERS.

Apollyon and the Reaction of the Slavonians; with a Review of the Political State of Europe under the Action of the Contending Principles. By Colonel F. T. Buller, H.P., Author of "Thoughts on the Spirit of the Movement" 102

ART. PAGE.

VI. PHILOSOPHY OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY.

1. Organization du Travail. Par M. Louis Blanc.
2. M. Chevalier's Reply to Louis Blanc.
3. The Rights of Labour 128

VII. CHEVALIER BUNSEN'S EGYPT.

Egypt's Place in Universal History: an Historical Investigation in Five Books. By Christian C. J. Bunsen, D.P. and D.C.L., Translated by C. N. Cottrell, Esq. 149

VIII. PEPYS' DIARY AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Diary and Correspondence of Samuel Pepys, F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the Reigns of Charles II. and James II.: with a Life and Notes. By Richard, Lord Braybrooke 174

IX. INDIRECT TAXATION.

The Statistical Companion. Compiled by T. C. Banfield, Statistical Clerk to the Council of Education; and C. R. Weld, Assistant Secretary to the Royal Society. 190

X. IRELAND AND THE CHANNEL ISLANDS.

Ireland and the Channel Islands; or a Remedy for Ireland. By Charles Le Quesne, Esq. 203

XI. THE CONTINENTAL REVOLUTION.

1. The Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies of Holy Scriptures: with Notes, and an Outline of the Various Interpretations. By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge.
2. The Great Continental Revolution, marking the Expiration of the Times of the Gentiles, A.D. 1847-8. By James Hatley Frere, Esq. 214

XII. GOSPEL HARMONY.

Contributions towards an Harmony of the Holy Gospels . 225

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

PAGE.

Letters to a Waverer on the Romish Controversy. By the Rev. Samuel Hobson, LL.B. 233

Christian Consolation. By Daniel Moore, M.A. 234

Essays on Human Happiness. By Dr. Henry Duhring . . . 234

The Imperial Dictionary, English, Technological, and Scientific; adapted to the present state of Literature, Science and Art. Edited by John Ogilvie, LL.D. 235

Sir Theodore Broughton; or, Laurel Water. By G. P. R. James, Esq. 236

Six Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse. By E. B. Denison, M.A. . 237

France and its Revolutions; a Pictorial History. By G. Long, Esq. 238

Life and Times of the Rev. Philip Henry, M.A., Father of the Commentator 238

Tales of Kirkbeck, or the Parish in the Fells 239

Female Examples, selected from the Holy Scriptures. For Young Persons. By a Clergyman's Daughter 239

Lays and Rhymes for the Times 240

Madonna Pia, and Other Poems. By James Gregor Grant . . 240

Essays. By Thomas M. Lester 241

The Authorship of Junius Elucidated; including a Biographical Memoir of Lieut.-Colonel Isaac Barré, M.P. By John Britton, F.S.A. 242

The Latin Church during the Anglo-Saxon Times. By Henry Soames, M.A. 242

British Diplomacy in Greece. By a Philhellene 243

The Dying Pillow made Easy for a Death Bed. By Robert Hawker, D.D. 243

PAGE.

The Complete Concordance to Shakspere; being a Verbal Index to all the Passages in the Dramatic Works of the Poet. By Mrs. Cowden Clarke 244

The Prize—The Hospital—The Singing Lessons—The Elder Children—A Village Story—The Friends 246

A Concise History of the Hampden Controversy. By the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A., F.R.S., S.A. 246

Bamfield on the Organization of Industry: a Course of Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge, in Easter Term, 1844 247

Excerpta Protestantia; comprising a View of the Church of England in the Aspect of her Articles and Homilies, and of her Antagonism to the Church of Rome 249

Adventures of an Aide-de-Camp; or, a Campaign in Calabria. By James Grant, Esq. 249

My Sister Minnie. By Mrs. Mackenzie Daniel 250

The Master and his Servants: an Allegory. By the Rev. W. H. Ridley, A.M. 250

Emmeline; or, Good Humour. By Mrs. E. Smith 250

Tales for the Times. No. I.—The Young Protestant; or, The Compass of Land and Sea to make one Proselyte. By a Clergyman. 251

The Last Day 251

Sermons on Practical Subjects. By the Rev. S. Warren, LL.D. 251

The Thirty-nine Articles no Test of Heresy 251

A Brief Sketch of Human Nature in Innocency. By the Rev. W. Gurden Moore, M.A. 252

The Gospel of Christ the Power of God unto Salvation. By the Rev. W. A. Newman, M.A. 252

A Pilgrimage to Rome: containing some account of the High Ceremonies, the Monastic Institutions, the Religious Services, the Sacred Relics, the Miraculous Pictures, and the general State of Religion in that City. By the Rev. M. H. Seymour, M.A. 252

CONTENTS.

ART. PAGE.

I. HISTORY AND RELIGION OF MANKIND.

Sacred Annals; or, Researches into the History and Religion of Mankind, from the Creation to the Death of Isaac: deduced from the Writings of Moses and other Inspired Authors; and Illustrated by Copious References to the Ancient Records, Traditions, and Mythology of the Heathen World. By G. Smith, F.S.A. . 253

II. GERMANY DURING THE REFORMATION.

History of the Reformation in Germany. By Leopold Ranke. Translated by Sarah Austin. 283

III. THE CHURCH, THE KINGDOM, AND THE ISLE OF MAN.

The Isle of Man: its History, Physical, Ecclesiastical, Civil, and Legendary. By the Rev. Joseph George Cumming, M.A., Vice-Principal of King William's College, Castletown. 309

IV. SEYMOUR'S PILGRIMAGE TO ROME.

A Pilgrimage to Rome: containing some Account of the High Ceremonies, the Monastic Institutions, the Religious Services, the Sacred Relics, the Miraculous Pictures, and the General State of Religion in that City. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M.A. 353

V. THE NIGER EXPEDITION.

A Narrative of the Expedition sent by her Majesty's Government to the River Niger, in 1841, under the Command of Captain H. D. Trotter, R.N. By Captain William Allen, R.N., and T. R. H. Thompson, M.D., Surgeon, R.N. 362

ART. PAGE

VI. THE PANSLAVIC AND GERMANIC MOVEMENTS.

Panslavism and Germanism. By Count Valerian Krasinski, Author of the "Reformation in Poland." 374

VII. POLYGLOT STANDARD VERSIONS.

1. Bibliæ Ecclesiæ Polyglotta: the Proper Lessons for Sundays; together with the whole of the Book of Psalms in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English. Edited by Frederic Iliff, D.D.
2. The English Hexapla; exhibiting the Six Importan Translations of the New Testament Scriptures—Wicliff, Tyndale, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Rhemish, Authorized. The Original Greek Text, after Scholz, with the Various Readings of the Textus Receptus, and the Principal Constantinopolitan and Alexandrine Manuscripts; and a Complete Collection of Scholz's Text, with Griesbach's Edition of MDCCCV.; preceded by a History of English Translations and Translators.
3. The Hexapla Psalter: The Book of Psalms. Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, in Six Parallel Columns.
4. A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort, A.D. 1554, about the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies of the Church. 406

VIII. MITHRIDATES MINOR.

1. Mithridates Minor; or, an Essay on Language. By. H. Welsford, Esq.
2. On the Origin and Ramifications of the English Language. By H. Welsford, Esq.
3. The Origin of the English, Germanic, and Scandinavian Languages and Nations. By the Rev. Joseph Bosworth, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A.
4. A Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary. By the Rev. Joseph Bosworth, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A. . 425

IX. THE PARLIAMENTARY SESSION.

Mr. Disraeli's Speech on the Labours of the Session. . . 445

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

PAGE.

Germany, England, and Scotland; or, the Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D. 461

Mirabeau: a Life History, in Four Books 469

The Gap of Barnesmore. A Tale of the Irish Highlands and the Revolution of 1688. 471

History of the Jesuits, from the Foundation of their Society to its Suppression: their Mission throughout the World: their Educational System and Literature; with their Revival and Present State. By Andrew Steinmetz 473

Ireland before and after the Union with Great Britain. By R. M. Martin, Esq., Author of the "History of the British Colonies." 477

Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum, Philone et Josepho, Patribus Apostolicis, aliisque Ecclesiæ Antiquæ Scriptoribus, necnon Libris Apocryphis, maxime deprompta, instruxit atque ornavit Novi Testamenti Hellenistice illustrati recens. Editor, Thomas Grinfield, M.A. 482

Loyalty and Religion the Safeguard of the Nation. By the Rev. B. Banning, M.A., Vicar of Wellington, Salop 482

Poems. By J. H. Röhrs, Late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge 483

A Familiar Explanation of the Higher Parts of Arithmetic. By the Rev. Frederick Calder, B.A., Head Master of the Grammar School, Chesterfield. 484

The One Hope of All Believers, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures: a Word for Warningand Strengthening in an Evil Day 482

The Closing Scene; or Christianity and Infidelity Contrasted in the Last Hours of Remarkable Persons. By the Author of "The Bishop's Daughter," "Self-Sacrifice," the "Life Book of a Labourer," &c. 485

The Young Westminster. No. I. 487

A Summary Practical Elucidation of National Economy in Support of Direct Taxation and Direct Assessment. By Robert Watt. 488

The Speeches of the Right Hon. the Earl of Chatham: with a Biographical Memoir. 488

PAGE.

An Authentic Interpretation of the Guarantee of England and France, with reference to the Duchy of Schleswig. Compiled from Documentary Sources. By Dr. William Leverkus . . 489
Arithmetic for Young Children. By H. Grant. 490
Testimony to the Truth: or, the Autobiography of an Atheist . 490
Questions on Church History: from the Earliest Period to the Present Time. Addressed Particularly to Young Persons. 490
Egypt and Nubia. From Sketches by David Roberts, R.A.; the Literature by William Brockendon 491
The Voice of Many Waters. A Tale for Young People . . 491
The Bible of Every Land; or, a Sacred History, Critical and Philosophical, of all the Versions of the Scriptures, in every Language and Dialect into which Translations have been made 492
A Letter to Lord John Russell on Church Reform 492
Original Thoughts on Various Passages of Scripture; being the Substance of Sermons preached by the late Rev. Richard Cecil, A.M., never before published. 493
The Gathering of Israel; or, the Patriarchal Blessing, as contained in the Forty-ninth Chapter of Genesis. 494
Baptism; or, the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church, scripturally illustrated and explained 495
Hints on the Management of Female Parochial Schools. . . 496
A Letter Addressed to the Church by a Member of the Church of England, on the Holy Mystery of the "First Resurrection, the Day of the Restoration of the Kingdom of Israel" . . 496
Fifty-two Sermons, adapted to each Sunday in the Year, and designed more especially to trace and explain the Connection between the Doctrines, Duties, and Consolation, of Religion. 497
The Revolutions of 1848. A Re-commencement of the Judgments upon the Papacy. By Charles Richard Cameron, M.A. 497
Defects in the Practice of Life Assurance, and Suggestions for their Remedy. 497
Matutina: Morning Readings, Selected and Original, chiefly Practical, and adapted to the Use of the Younger Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. G. Renaud, M.A. . . 498
Presbytery Examined: an Essay, Critical and Historical, on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation . . 499

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

JULY, MDCCCXLVIII.

ART. I.—*Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power.* By the Rev. J. L. ROSS, M.A. London: Parker. 1848.

WHEN any two things are brought into comparison, in order to determine their relative importance, we must cast out of the estimate such points in either case as may be variable or accidental, and rely only on those points of comparison which are unchangeable and are permanent characteristics of both the one and the other of the things which we would so compare. And if, for mere accuracy of comparison, such discrimination between the real and the accidental qualities of things be necessary, much more imperative does it become when estimating the comparative obligations of living institutions which cannot but act upon and modify each other. We are here forced to draw a distinction between the temporary and the permanent characteristics of such institutions when considering the reciprocal obligations and competing claims of two bodies like the Church and State to which we all owe allegiance: and we cannot but take into our account the modification to which these claims are liable under the various circumstances of the State having been at one time heathen, at another time Christian; and the additional claims which the Church acquires when it has been established in a land and is recognised as one of the estates of the realm.

The questions which now arise amongst us receive no sufficient solution from the mere letter of Scripture, nor does the

past history of the Church afford precedents which meet the case. Our circumstances are so entirely altered—the Church and State occupy such very different positions towards each other from those which they occupied at any former period—that the abstract principles which guided the Church at the beginning and under trials far more severe are our only guide, which principles we may not pervert by falsely imputing to a Christian State features which belong to none but the heathen; nor yet so relax sacred principles as to sacrifice truth out of deference to those who have, however unintentionally, set themselves in a false position either in the Church or the State.

During the first, second, and third centuries of Church history, the powers of the world were not merely unchristian or simply careless and indifferent to religion: they were ranged in active hostility against the Church. This arose from two causes, both singly sufficient, but, being combined, each tended to aggravate the other. The heathen were strongly prejudiced against all Jews, and it was amongst this loathed and despised people that the new religion had arisen; added to which, they beheld the Jews themselves opposing those who professed Christianity amongst them with the utmost rancour; and, having crucified their King and the Author of our faith, they persecuted his followers from city to city with deadly hatred. And the heathen might thus appeal to notorious and universal facts, and say, with perfect truth, that the new religion was everywhere spoken against by the Jews themselves as well as by the Gentiles.

And looking at the Church itself, whether we regard the body or its individual members, the separation from the world was much more complete and absolute than it could possibly continue to be for any great length of time even under heathen government; while the subsequent conversion of the State to the religion of the Church, and the establishment of Christianity as the State religion, necessarily produced an entire alteration in their reciprocal obligations towards each other: and as in after times the Church became endowed with lands and possessions, it became the duty of the State both to protect these possessions of its subjects, and to see that they were not misappropriated, but were applied to the purposes for which they were originally given; which possessions, moreover, invested the Church with the civil rights and customary dues of such tenancy or tenure, and so brought the Church under fresh obligations to the State.

These various complicating elements cannot be overlooked

with safety by any who would form an impartial opinion: and Churchmen, in writing on such subjects, need to be more especially upon their guard: since they are not only in danger of forming a partial judgment by constituting themselves the judges in a cause which is their own; but, where both parties have occasionally been in fault, by stretching these proper means of influence beyond their just bounds. Yet it is a notorious fact that the prelacy has at sundry times not only encroached upon but trampled under foot the just and indubitable rights of the civil power. It, therefore, becomes all men who would come to right conclusions on a subject which equally affects all the members of a Christian community to be quite sure that they are taking their stand on principles which are immutable, and which will not be affected by any alteration of circumstances, or rather which will serve as rules of conduct in every case, and are large enough to embrace every possible variety of condition either in the Church or in the civil power.

The apostolic epistles were written either to Jewish or to Gentile converts: the former had only just emerged from Judaism: the prejudices and traditions received from their fathers were still clinging to them. They had been brought into bondage under the heathen by their own sin; but, instead of "accepting the punishment of their iniquity" and repenting of their sin, they only chafed under the yoke and charged the fault upon others. They generally held it to be sinful to pay tribute or to give any other token of submission to the government under which they then lived and enjoyed protection from their worst enemies—from their own countrymen: and the Gentile converts, to whom the other apostolic epistles were written, had been gathered out of the darkness of heathenism and had every thing old to abandon—every thing new to learn: and while both the Jewish and Heathen systems were to be forsaken in order to receive the truths of Christianity, yet the Jewish priesthood and ritual were to be treated with reverence as long as the temple stood; and the laws of Rome were to be respected as being conducive to the welfare of society, although the State was heathen, and the emperor should be such an one as Tiberius or Nero; for God was to be honoured in his temple and priesthood as long as he saw fit to tolerate it and avert its destruction; and the providence of God is to be acknowledged in that government under which he has placed us, and from obedience to which men ought not to emancipate themselves: but it becomes evident that the apostolic epistles, written under

circumstances so dissimilar to our own, cannot furnish in themselves any exact or sufficient directions for us who live under a Christian State; nor are they to be regarded as though they were lectures on abstract duty, since they are each one of them written on specified and peculiar emergencies, and can, therefore, only apply strictly and in all their force to a Church under similar circumstances, and exposed to temptations and trials of the same kind as were those of the Galatian or Corinthian Churches.

And in consulting the Old Testament, in order to obtain principles for guiding our conduct, another element must likewise be taken into consideration, which it is the more necessary to attend to, inasmuch as it bears upon the principle itself and strikes deeper than those differences which depend upon difference of circumstances. This element is the typical character of all the Mosaic institutions, and of the children of Israel themselves, before the time of Moses and afterwards, under their judges or kings—in the wilderness or in Canaan —under Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, or the Romans. And, as it is this typical element in the history of the Jewish people which renders all that is recorded concerning them instructive to us, so we must ascertain to what time and to what condition of things these types were intended to be applied; as we shall otherwise incur the risk of distorting and perverting them by forced and strained applications, having no better foundation than ingenuity seconding our own preconceived opinions.

The children of Israel and the Christian Church are addressed in nearly the same terms, as a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people (1 Peter xi. 9; Exodus xix. 6). This is a divine declaration that the constitution of the people of God is essentially monarchical and priestly, both under the Jewish and Christian dispensations; and we may not practise equivocation or evade the force of these declarations by saying that no more was meant than what had actually been realized at the time when the words were spoken—when the children of Israel were wandering in the wilderness and had not been yet brought into the promised land, or when the Church had even less semblance of the reality, and when St. Peter addresses them at the commencement of his epistle as strangers scattered abroad, and exhorts them as strangers and pilgrims to an honest conversation among the Gentiles, looking forward to a day of visitation in which God should be glorified.

This day of visitation St. Peter calls "the appearing of

Jesus Christ," and "the revelation of Jesus Christ" (i. 7, 13); and, in his second epistle (i. 11), speaks of it as "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But he forewarns the Church that they would be in great danger of becoming unmindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets concerning this kingdom, and of the commandments which the apostles of the Lord and Saviour had given; for that in the last days scoffers should come, saying, "Where is the promise of his coming?—but that the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, being only long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Peter iii. 2-9). And Christ himself, when solemnly questioned by Pilate, declared that he was a King—that for this end he was born and came into the world; but that his kingdom was not yet come: and he taught his disciples to pray day by day that his kingdom might come, and so the will of God might be done in earth as it is in heaven. And seeing that the Scribes and Pharisees were all in error in this matter, and would have cut him short in his work and before the appointed time if he declared the whole truth plainly to them, he inculcated the duty of present obedience to the powers that be, in answering their insidious question concerning tribute, by saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's:" while St. Peter and the other apostles plainly and authoritatively lay it down as the bounden duty of the Church to submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers and for the praise of them that do well, that thus we may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: for it is through ignorance and folly that these duties are questioned or neglected.

All Christians are now aware of the fact that the fundamental mistake of the Jews was that of not distinguishing between the first and second coming of Christ; and, having their minds wholly intent upon the second and glorious coming of Messiah, they despised him when coming in humility to prepare the way for the kingdom. But this mistake was not an unnatural one; for, although the sacrifices of the law typified Christ the Victim and the Lamb of God who should die for the sins of the world, yet the priests who offered that sacrifice typified Christ's subsequent work of presenting the sacrifice offered upon the cross before the throne in heaven. And the high priest and the whole ceremonial, and especially the temple service and the kingdom

which came into manifestation in Solomon at the same time with the temple, were all typical of things still future—not of the Church and its services as at present existing, but of that to which the Church is leading, or for which the Church is preparing its members. All have reference to a future condition of things which we as yet only behold in part and as through a glass darkly, but shall see face to face in the day of the Lord; for when he shall appear we shall be like him and shall see him as he is (1 John iii. 2).

From the beginning it hath been so with respect to all types and prophecies: they have ever had the final consummation in view, and have held up this as the object of faith, and the goal of the race, and the time of rewarding the victorious ones: and, as it is a distant goal, the danger has always been of fainting by the way, and so abandoning all hope or taking up with something short of the reality, and either exaggerating the present or undervaluing the future, so as to cheat ourselves into the belief that we are already in possession of all that the Lord hath promised. Abraham, the father of the faithful, is also an instance of this short-coming in manifesting impatience at having to wait so long for Isaac, and in entreating the Lord that Ishmael might be the heir. The same impatience was manifested by the children of Israel in the days of the prophet Samuel by their insisting upon having a king before the time, the consequence of which was that David, the true king, was persecuted by Saul, and the establishment of the kingdom of Israel was long delayed. And a similar spirit actuated the Jews in the time of our Lord, leading them to expect the immediate manifestation of the latter day glory in the person of the Messiah; and, because none of this appeared in Jesus of Nazareth, they rejected his claims, and were themselves rejected and another people out of the Gentiles taken into covenant with God in their stead.

But, under the new covenant, the Christian Church has too generally manifested the same kind of spirit which was manifested by the Jews under the old covenant: though it has taken different forms of manifestation, it is one and the same spirit of impatience. Some are looking for justification by works, and these quite as formal and inefficacious as were the works of the law by which the Jews sought to be justified in the days of St. Paul—an error against which he contended so strenuously in enforcing the doctrine of justification by faith on the Galatian Church. Others, mistaking both the nature of types and the objects to which all the

types had reference, have endeavoured to combine the typical ceremonial of the law with the sacramental realities of the gospel, forgetting that the type and antitype cannot co-exist, and that if the reality be in existence that which foreshadowed it is become utterly vain and useless. But it is not only so—it is worse than useless: it springs from a mistake of the true object of all types; and, therefore, it originates in error and tends to inculcate that which is false, as if the Church had already obtained a position which belongs to the next dispensation.

The Jews held a truth, which pervades the whole of Scripture, in maintaining that the reign of the Messiah would be a visible and glorious reality, co-extensive with the bounds of the earth; believing that he shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth—that all kings shall fall down before him and all nations shall serve him—that his glorious name shall be blessed for ever, and the whole earth shall be filled with his glory (Psalm lxxii). The Jews were right in believing that these promises, which were only typified by the reign of Solomon in the imperfect manner and to that limited extent which the type of a thing necessarily implies, should have their full developement and exact accomplishment in the thing itself—that is, in the reign of the Messiah, which is the grand object to be kept in view for understanding all types and all prophecies. Over the Jews we have a great advantage in living after the first coming of our Lord; as, by knowing what was then fulfilled, we can both disencumber the prophecies of one of the greatest sources of perplexity to them, by seeing all that was said concerning the humiliation and rejection of the Messiah to have been already fulfilled; and also, by his transfiguration on Mount Tabor before his crucifixion and by his glorious ascension into heaven after his resurrection, we know assuredly that he, in the same personal subsistence, shall come a second time and "in like manner" to accomplish those prophecies which remain as yet unfulfilled. And this St. Peter declares in reminding us that we have a more sure word of prophecy, to which we do well to take heed; for it has been made more sure to us in our being able more fully to understand and more steadfastly to grasp in our faith the remaining prophecies; and the manner of their fulfillment is made more sure to us by the transfiguration and the ascension—namely, by the facts to which St. Peter is referring.

Christ only entered upon his glory at the ascension, when the Lord said unto David's Lord and our Lord, "Sit thou at

my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." Into that glory, his body, the Church, hath not yet entered, being still in a condition of suffering of which he was the example, as the Captain of our salvation, in the days of his abode on earth. It will be by the resurrection that the Church shall be put in possession of the kingdom, and this shall be effected by his second coming, when all that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of Man; and until that time we must be content to bear this earthly tabernacle; and, though we may groan under its burden, must wait for the second advent to be clothed upon with our house from heaven. And as it was in the same body that Christ arose from the dead, though in a far more glorious condition, so we shall resume the same form, although this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality: therefore it behoves us to use aright the body and all external things with which the body is conversant, seeing that our Lord hath put such honour upon our flesh as to carry it with him to the throne of God; and since it is an assured verity, and a fundamental article of the Christian faith, that the body is essential to human personality, and is the instrument by which the soul is reached, and by which we bear witness for God to man, that according to the deeds done in which we may be judged: therefore a spirit without a body is not man, nor capable of human action, nor under human responsibilities—is not, in short, the image of God, and the creature which God made on the sixth day of creation. Nor will the primæval purpose which was then expressed stand out complete until the dominion then promised to man shall be taken by Christ, and given, according to their place and degree, to all his faithful followers, in that kingdom which is called the regeneration or the restitution of all things. This is called the manifestation of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 19); and for it the groaning creation is represented as waiting; and we ourselves, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption—to wit, the redemption of the body. But this implies and carries along with it a submission to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, assured that this being the discipline under which he hath seen fit to place us, it is the very means by which we are being prepared for exercising the duties of a higher sphere, and are qualifying for the kingdom of heaven, which is to be revealed at the coming of the Lord; and even when we may be unable to discern the exact bearing of our present duties upon the future state, still we may lay hold of the encouraging assurances that all things are work-

ing together for good to them that love God; and, rejoicing in hope of the glory of God, can glory in tribulation also, knowing that it shall redound to praise and glory in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

It would be a vain and profitless employment of time to speculate on what man might have been if he had not fallen; or as to what man ought to be, under a perfect condition of things in the Church and in the State. We must take man as we find him, fallen from his true position and by nature at enmity with God; and we must regard the provisions, both in Church and State, according to their adaptation to the actual condition of man, and the means they afford for lifting man out of his natural degradation into the true place in which God at the first had set him, and to which those who believe in Christ Jesus shall be ultimately recovered—receiving the earnest of it in a spiritual sense now—receiving the fulness at the resurrection and in the world to come. It must be remembered that, as we are in a state of transition from a fallen condition to one of recovery, not only are the means of recovery lowered from the perfect standard to suit this transition state, but the administration of these means is entrusted to men as yet in an imperfect condition—not as though we had attained or were already perfect: nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, walking by the same rule and minding the same things (Phil. iii).

But man, though degraded, hath not wholly lost the apprehension and the sense of his noble origin and his glorious destiny; and it is to this latent principle, which the fall hath not wholly extinguished, that the invitations in the Gospel are addressed. We find, in all men, occasional yearnings and cravings after something beyond the present—something more satisfying and more durable than anything that the world can furnish. To such, how welcome is the call—"Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters"—"Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? And your labour for that which satisfieth not?"—"Incline your ear and come unto me: hear and your soul shall live." And unless these instinctive cravings of mankind be taken into the account, and be brought to bear upon the actual condition of things at the time, those who are responsible for good government in Church and State will fail in their endeavours, and the condition of the world will deteriorate. Individuals may quench this light within themselves, and may in their darkness pronounce it to be kindled by superstition in others; but the fact is too general—we had almost said universal—to admit of

such an explanation: the want of this yearning is the rare exception—the presence of it is the general rule; and it is, therefore, to be regarded as an instinct of human nature, common to all men.

And in the historic fact that all wise governors have found it necessary to enlist this principle on their side, by making religion their concern and having respect to the faith which was prevalent among the people at the time, there is a testimony to the depth and universality of the feeling which no thoughtful person will lightly regard, or attribute with the vulgar and the superficial to mere priestcraft. That much of the religion which was so employed was false, will be conceded by every one; but this does not prove that it was wrong to use it, or that the principle appealed to was false. True religion came by revelation, and was only to be found in the line of the faithful: the heathen could not discover it for themselves, but might acquire some imperfect knowledge of it by tradition. The necessity felt by all legislators for consulting the religious feelings of mankind is all that we are asserting; and, if they took the best religion to which they had access, it is all that could be expected of them as heathen.

The heathen legislator, as a man, was conscious of the same need of religion which the people felt; and he must, like them, have recourse to the priests and ministers of religion to receive instruction and obtain mediation: for there never has been a religion which did not acknowledge these two things—instruction derived from some higher source, and the necessity of a mediator between us and God; which is one of the many instances of the foreshadowing of Christianity, in its two fundamental principles, of being by divine revelation and in the hands of a mediator. As the legislator himself should advance in religion, so it would be his duty to carry forward the people; and especially to take care that they had free access to those whose business it was to instruct all alike, and to superintend those rites and ceremonies which are both the expression and the sustenance of the religion of a people; and this, which would be his obvious course in any case, becomes a paramount duty in a Christian State; since it not only rests upon the knowledge of the certainty of the religion we profess, and the importance of encouraging it to every wise legislator; but, knowing that Christianity imposes on every believer the duty of confessing Christ before men, the Christian legislator must do so in all his acts, as he will have to answer in the day of judgment for the effect which these acts shall have, not only on the present but also on the future welfare of mankind

—not only on the comfort of their bodies but on the salvation of their souls.

All our readers would, no doubt, reject with scorn the Socialism and Communism of France, and the kindred doctrines of the Owenites and Chartists in England; but the same materialism which, when carried to those lengths, is repulsive, may be so disguised and modified as to become attractive to many. And we have no hesitation in affirming that the Communist doctrines are only the bold and open avowal of principles which are very generally prevalent, but which are not in general followed out into their natural and legitimate consequence—which are, in short, entertained as speculations rather than as principles for the guidance of men: and the mischief of these reckless speculations only appears when other men whose conduct is reckless, and who have had no principle to guide them, seek justification and countenance in the sophistries of men more able than themselves, and find a plausible and colourable defence in these abstractions and generalities which were never intended to be reduced to practice. Sophistry in the former and passion in the latter have taken the place which truly belongs to reason.

If we endeavour to treat man as a mere animal, and confine our views of society to such things as tend to promote and secure animal enjoyment alone and the well-being of the body—such as food, raiment, or even wealth and luxurious living, to the neglect of the mind—we shall experience continual disappointment. Man being more than an animal, and being endowed with higher instincts and cravings of soul as well as body, these higher wants will put in their claims and exact their rights, and they will be found to be paramount either for good or for evil—for the blessing of individuals and of society, when under moral retraint and directed to that which is virtuous and praiseworthy—and in terrible retribution upon those men or those bands who are so deluded as to pervert or abuse these noble gifts of God to selfish gratification or any sordid purposes. As among the wise, where moral restraints are held in respect, these are found to be the only ones which are effectual, either to meet the desires or to controul the unruly passions of man—so, when moral restraints are neglected, the moral evils which ensue will be found to be the direst of all miseries; and, under the boiling and lashing of this feverish anguish, a convulsive and maniac energy is sometimes aroused, in comparison with which the restraints of decorum and of law would be only

like manacles of tow on the arms of an infuriated demoniac:—

"Man's nature is not limited solely to this world, but is formed for higher and more lasting destinies: his moral powers are not mainly, much less solely, designed for a bounded and temporary sphere of action; but here form the elements and infancy of faculties almost unlimited, which stretch into nobler regions, not so much of boundless space as the more congenial and satisfying objects of desire and pursuits of immortality. All notions of government, not of the material but the moral man, which do not recognise those principles of his nature which are the governing motives of his conduct, and by which alone a being destined for immortality can be influenced, will fail, except in a very subordinate degree, to realise the object which civil government contemplated: and this for a very obvious and intelligible reason; for as, in the absence even of revelation, the pantings of the soul after a future state of existence clearly and strongly indicate that this life is only the infancy of its being, so it will, by experience, be found that it is impossible to separate mere human interests from those which have reference to a future and higher state of existence: though it cannot, without revelation, be clearly ascertained that this future state will prove one of moral retribution. Still there is sufficient evidence, from an examination of the intellectual part of man's constitution, to conclude that his faculties in this life are only the prelude to their higher development hereafter; and that, in consequence, all that interests them in this world must have a sensible bearing on similar, though higher, interests of a future state of being. Both our intellectual powers and the objects of their interest in this earlier and inferior state are closely, nay, inseparably, united with their future development and future higher interests; so that they may be viewed as the same, or as one influencing or containing as it were the other. It must accordingly be seen that what relates to this life can only be adequately attained by taking into consideration and influencing those faculties and feelings which evince, by their existence and necessary operation, that the source from which they emanate is eternal and divine" (6).

And the more that men advance in civilization and mental culture the more obvious does this truth become, and the more difficult is it to minister efficiently and satisfactorily to the growing faculties and feelings of this moral principle within. In this, as in all other cases, it is found that subdivision of labour is the only way of surmounting the difficulty of understanding the complex requirements of the body and the soul of man, and regulating the diverse and often competing elements of the individual and the community. Hence has arisen the necessity of assigning these important duties to distinct classes of men—to statesmen who should direct their

attention exclusively to the proper ordering of the affairs of the community or the public, and to ecclesiastics who should occupy themselves with spiritual concerns both among governors and governed; and, by the sedulous inculcation of one invariable system of true faith and sound principle, make their respective duties plain and easy to both. The ministers of religion, devoted to this one pursuit, are presumed to be in possession of all the truth which has been at the time discovered, having fewer cares to distract them, and being in a position of greater impartiality than those who are engaged in secular affairs; and they themselves are among the governed, and have therefore a bias, if at all, on the side of the party which is most in danger of oppression, and thus may minister a check where it is most needed, and yet in a form void of suspicion and without offence, as coming in the abstract form of inculcating religious principle and truths of eternal obligation. Nor should we refuse our assent to this, although a corrupt priesthood may have abused their power, in Heathen and even in Christian times, to purposes which were tyrannical or superstitious. The abuse only proves that there is such a principle in man, and that the exclusive attention of one class of men is requisite to develop and to guide it, the corrective lying in our so profitting by their instructions as to render it impossible that they should mislead or deceive.

In ruder and coarser species of manufacture, one man may perform it all, but it will be a kind of work fit only for rude conditions of society; and so in the earlier ages, those functions which belong to the Church and those which belong to the State were often combined in the same person, the chief being sometimes both high priest and chief magistrate, and the king being at other times also Pontifex Maximus; but the advance of society complicates the duties of sovereignty and of priesthood to such a degree as to render it impossible for one individual properly to discharge both; while the same progress leads the community to require that the functions both of the king and the priest shall be exercised, not for the pleasure of the ruler or merely according to his will, but for the benefit of the community, and therefore under responsibility to secure all possible care and diligence and exactness in the administration—guarding against incompetency, or tyranny, or abuse of power.

Nay, so complicated are the duties and so great are the responsibilities of the ruler in highly civilized states of society that, even when the kingly and priestly functions are separated, one individual, though the foremost of his class, is not found

capable of fully discharging the duties required of him without the assistance of all the most intelligent members of that body to which he belongs, they also sharing the responsibility together with him. Some men have a natural aptitude for entering into and rightly understanding the political aspect and secular relationship of things: others, with not higher talents, may have greater pleasure in contemplating things abstractly, and in their principles more than in their practical operations. Men receiving the same general education at an university will have these several aptitudes developed under the same courses of study, and will in after life fall into that class for which they are by nature qualified, as opportunity is afforded.

The fact of so many ecclesiastics having been statesmen, in the middle ages, arose from the accidental circumstance of all the education of the time being confined to the clergy; and a man's receiving anything like a tolerable education in those days was tantamount to an avowal that he was destined for the Church; and, as the less robust members of a family were singled out for the cloister, and their course of life would tend rather to increase than remove natural infirmities, so it is not surprising to find that, in an age when strength of body opened the way to martial distinction and all the prizes of ambition, that learning should have been looked upon with much contempt and those who followed it as an inferior class, fit for nothing else. But out of this class some of the ablest statesmen arose, which only proves that they were gifted by nature with political sagacity, which education had developed and improved: for of many of them it is to be observed that they were very bad Churchmen, and that under other circumstances they would either not have entered on a sacred calling the duties of which they neglected and outraged, or they would have been disowned by a class with whom they had no sympathy.

Church and State, as we understand it, is a refinement which is the growth and the boast of modern times: it is pre-eminently and exclusively the offspring of an advanced state of society, for the right ordering of which it is necessary that all the existing talent of the age should have its free exercise and full development, and therefore that every one should be kept in his proper place, directing his talents to their proper objects through the right channels; and, consequently, that there should be checks wherever there is any danger of tendency to an abuse. We have not much value for precedents drawn from the Law or from the Gospel, beyond the use of them for establishing a few general principles in the question

of Church and State; and this because neither the Jewish nor early Christian communities were in circumstances at all similar to our own: still less do we value the precedents or warnings (for they are as often used in the one sense as in the other), which the history of the Church under Constantine, and afterwards during Papal times, affords. The conduct of imperial Rome, even when Christianized, is no model for that of a limited monarchy; and the Papacy in its arrogance and worldliness had usurped the functions of the State, and virtually annihilated the power of the civil ruler wherever it was able to gain the ascendancy. The union of Church and State amongst us is a part of the English constitution; and, like all the other parts of the same, it has grown out of the circumstances and exigencies of the times, and has, therefore, been suited to those exigencies.

It was not by framing abstract theories, and working up to these as a beau ideal, that the British constitution in Church and State became what it now is—the admiration of the world, and standing imperturbable in the midst of convulsions which are shaking all and overturning many of the thrones of Christendom. But it was by following the dictates of plain common sense—while things are well, letting well alone, and when a want was felt, providing for that want—that the British constitution has grown to be what it is—a constitution suited to the people and a people truly appreciating the constitution; and this explains why the attempts to copy the English constitution in other countries have been in general such signal failures. The elements were wanting—the people are the embodiment and the carrying out of the constitution: if there be not this living machinery ready to act in accordance with the principles which are enunciated in the law, statutes of the most wise legislators will be a dead letter, admired by those whom they do not affect, but practically disregarded by all who ought to be controlled by them.

The fact is that, whether as cause or consequence of the English constitution, the people of England are more accustomed to law and order, and more unanimous in maintaining it than any other nation; and each man thinks it a more important duty to uphold the law, which is for the good of all, than to consider what may be the line of conduct which is most conducive to his immediate interest on any particular occasion; and when a burden or grievance is felt, the sufferer will ask himself whether it is capable of a legal remedy, or whether it can be removed from his shoulders without laying heavier burdens upon other members of the community, and

without removing wholesome restraints which have contributed to ensure the general tranquility; because the same general principle which induces respect for law and order in the abstract will tend towards maintaining those institutions which already exist; and it must be shown that it will be for the good of the whole community to remodel or change them, in order to justify such an undertaking, and that a burden which presses upon particular individuals may be removed with perfect safety and with the prospect of advantage to the whole community. Such a case should be made out by any individual who would propose a change in the law to relieve himself; and such a case should be made out by any class in the State which seeks for an alteration in those laws which determine its relation to, and connection with, other classes in the State and other members of the community.

We think that the true way of arriving at safe practical conclusions in the question of the relationship between Church and State is by considering it constitutionally, and as having grown out of occurrences that actually arose, as was the case with the common law of the land. Our ancestors were no speculators; but they provided remedies for every evil as it appeared, and endeavoured so to provide as to meet every future contingency, and to guard against the recurrence of such evil, not in one form only, but in any other form. When the Church became endowed with lands and her dignitaries became temporal lords, this brought them under the power of the State: for the State became bound to spread its protecting arm over these lands or goods after they were made over to the Church, just in the same manner as when they were held by laymen; and the obligations to the State of tribute or service should in strict justice continue the same, whether remaining in the hands of the lay lord, or transferred by him to an ecclesiastical body.

It is one of the most universal features of all civil compacts that they are reciprocal: the ruler undertakes the protection of all, and to administer the laws which are for the good of all, with strict impartiality to all alike, of whatsoever rank or whatsoever class they may be; and all subjects undertake in return to obey the laws, and especially those which attach to the possession of property, and which for this cause are generally recited afresh whenever land passes into other hands, that each new possessor may know the tenure under which he holds his lands or his title thereto.

This is the theory of the law, and it is strict justice also; but during the dark ages all things got into confusion, partly

from the ignorance and superstition of the laity, but chiefly from the false position into which the Church was brought thereby: for the Church which monopolised nearly all the learning and talent of the time found knowledge to be power, and was tempted so to use it as to draw all other power into her own hands, and to centre it all in the Roman pontiff. And in furtherance of this, the ecclesiastics of all lands endeavoured to render themselves independent of the civil power, and succeeded for a time in almost all the States of Europe, England in a considerable degree and France in a lesser degree being the only countries that withstood the encroachments of the Papacy, so as to uphold the necessary authority of the civil ruler. We all know, from the history of Thomas a Becket, how hard the struggle was to preserve the royal supremacy in England; and in all subsequent times we feel persuaded that the State has shewn great moderation, has only required such submission from the clergy as it became all subjects of whatever class or degree to render, and has only resisted such encroachments as would virtually create an *imperium in imperio*, and render the administration of just and equal laws not merely difficult but absolutely impossible.

We do not think that the clergy who complain of the present state of things take a fair view of the case. Many of them argue as if one who had taken holy orders had been loosed thereby from every other obligation; and, in being separated from worldly callings, had ceased to be a subject and under the laws of the State. This entire exemption was claimed by the clergy in Papal times, and not only in civil but in criminal cases; so that even the felon and the murderer often put in the plea of benefit of the clergy. The absurdity of such exemptions in criminal cases has long been recognised; but distinctions and exemptions which are equally absurd in principle are from time to time urged in behalf of the clergy, though they have nothing to rest upon save the precedents which these same barbarous times of Papal usurpation can alone furnish—precedents which would be scouted in any other respects even by those who adduce them in support of the stilted pretensions of Tractarianism.

The clergy, like all other classes of Englishmen, are already represented in both Houses of Parliament. Each clergyman has a vote for the election of members to the House of Commons, and the universities send thither their representatives; while the higher interests of the whole Church are watched over in the most efficient and dignified manner by

the archbishops and bishops in the House of Lords. Thus the clergy, as men and members of a community, have their rights acknowledged, and find their place of equality together with their fellow subjects of the laity; and all have the same means of redress for temporal grievances, and a voice in the legislature through which their wants may be made known, and a place in the constitution of the land.

But we have already shewn that the spiritual duties of the clergy, in order to be efficiently discharged, must engross the whole man, and so leave to every conscientious clergyman neither time nor thought for public exertions, especially for those of a secular kind. Wisely, therefore, and most considerately, has it been ordered that the clergy should not be admissible into the House of Commons; and even in the House of Lords the sacred bench are found best consulting the interests of the Church and best preserving their own dignity by mingling as little as possible in debates on subjects of a political nature, and by confining themselves to the solemn enunciation of those Christian principles which are involved in, or affected by, the questions which are brought before that august assembly. We think that this is a sufficient share in secular legislation to protect those rights and interests which belong to the clergy as a separate class, and that it is as large a share as the clerical body ought to expect or could efficiently undertake: for, by education, course of life, and habit, those who belong to the sacred profession are less capable of managing secular affairs than men of business are, and they also view things rather in the abstract than in a practical common-sense way. Moreover, in a Christian land, religion is not under the sole keeping of the clergy; but every man is presumed to be a member of the Church, and, as such, to act at all times under the influence of Christian principles, and to allow of nothing contrary to the faith established and the national Church.

The proper sphere of influence is the pulpit and the parish. By implanting Christian principles in the heart of the laity he will act more powerfully through these upon the State than he could do by his own direct efforts either in the national legislature or in an assembly of the clergy, and he will be acting legitimately; for in his parish the clergyman is at home, and there, by a right use of his means and opportunities, he is almost omnipotent. It is his province to rule and inform the heart, so that the affections and the will, which are the foundation of duty and the springs of action, may be in agreement with the revealed will of God. By this spiritual influence over the souls of men he may control and guide

their actions, and may furnish them with Christian principles applicable alike to all, and in the light of which each man in his own place may use all the talents and means and opportunities which Providence affords him to the glory of God, and consequently to the real good of mankind.

Our author justly maintains that "mere secular instruction is incompetent to reach and to influence the higher part of our nature; or, more properly, to render its whole complicated structure available to the object for which it was designed—the promotion, in effect, of the real interests of the individual, and so, by the incorporation of these individuals, of a nation; for such a system possesses no proper power to influence the moral affections so as to deter from evil or supply motives for the performance of good" (8).

And this is true not only concerning the instruction which is given in its most elementary form to the young, but is true throughout life, and of the education for heaven which is going on in the Church continually, that all may be brought to one mind in Christ, which is called in Scripture "the perfect man." Of this higher, this manly, and lifelong education, the clergy, who are the ambassadors of Christ, are the schoolmasters; and, as in discharging this higher duty towards parents they will be at the same time taking the most effectual means of guaranteeing a religious education for the children, so also such an education of the young is the ground-work and preparation for the instructions of the clergy to the heads of families, and religious families which we may expect such children to become. "Train up a child in the way that he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

But the State is only a larger family—the nation is only a larger parish. As the child forms the future man and the nation is but an aggregate of individuals, so every thing done to the child and to the individual is to be regarded as done to the nation: for both the child and the nation are by their education destined to become religious and prosperous if rightly cared for—the contrary in both cases if neglected.

It will ever be futile and vain to endeavour to separate things which have been joined together by God. Man is constituted a moral being by the Creator, and can only be dealt with by having respect to his moral being, which finds its expression chiefly in religious acts. Religion, as it be true or false, will influence the conduct of men, and must be taken into account by every wise and thoughtful legislator. We do not allow that there is a natural void in man's being which may remain empty, and which that which is called religion

may fill—we do not allow the instances of persons calling themselves irreligious, or appearing so to others, as any sufficient proof of this defect: for, on similar grounds, it might be alleged that man is void of reason, because some men are idiots or act as if they were without reason. Such cases are only to be regarded as anomalies and exceptions. Moreover, we find that those who profess the greatest indifference to religion are not really indifferent, but insist on their own creed of liberality with all the fervour of religious zealots; shewing that the principle is within them still, and that, after all their parade of irreligion, they are not without it, but only possessing a religion that is false.

"On this principle, accordingly, a nation must proceed; and, besides forming the resolution to establish the Christian faith, must bend itself seriously to the weighty task of selecting and establishing a branch of the universal Church, which, with all its vital and essential principles, whether of doctrine or system, has been founded by Christ. ...Both the moral and intellectual portions of man's compound nature, which, from the absence of proper knowledge and adequate motives could not in heathen times be brought to bear by individuals or the ruling power on individual happiness or for the purpose of government, are now duly influenced by the knowledge which revelation imparts and the high principles of action which it inspires, and by the adoption on the part of the civil power of the Church's divine system of instruction for effecting the object of all good government—the promotion of the public good" (48-51.)

The Church has enough to do in this, its great and appropriate work of laying the foundations of all sound legislation and all good government, by inculcating and enforcing Christian principles on the laity, on whom the management of secular affairs properly devolves, the clergy themselves being examples of obedience to the laws and of the scrupulous fulfilment of all such duties belonging to them in common with the other subjects of the State. And, as the existence of a nation implies community of feeling on all great points, and as no nation can prosper without unity—unity in the highest sense and in the most important things—so all the several classes must co-operate heart and mind to attain it. The true way of arriving at such an union is, not by the discussion of abstract principles, or by adopting the projects of theorists; but by every man minding his own business and working diligently in his own proper sphere, and allowing all other men to mind theirs: each believing that God will give him wisdom and grace to fulfil the duties of his own calling; but each doubting whether he has any of the talent requisite

for that place, whatever it may be, to which he has not been called and to which another has. And it is in doing the duties of his place, up to the measure of the knowledge which each already possesses, that he will acquire more knowledge and become qualified for a higher place. In the highest as in the lowest things practice makes perfect, as Christ, who came to make known the will of God, has declared—"My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine."

Legislation requires a practical knowledge of secular affairs, which can only be acquired by men who mix intimately with all classes of mankind, and have a direct interest in the right ordering of the things of this world, and have themselves to administer and obey the laws which are framed, and such are the men best qualified to originate and improve the code; and, therefore, the duties of legislation, so far as it concerns temporal things, are best understood by the laity. But inasmuch as man's nature is compound, and even in legislation he has to look far beyond temporal things, and to regulate his conduct according to principles of eternal truth and with reference to an hereafter, he must be taught these principles by the clergy—a class of men devoting themselves solely to the things which are eternal and keeping that hereafter before the eyes of men, who are in danger of becoming engrossed entirely in the urgently insisting claims put forward by the growing intelligence of the bulk of mankind.

It is difficult enough for the laity to keep pace with the advance of the age, and keep their spirits at the same time sufficiently alive to religion as the paramount concern. It is difficult enough for the clergy to avoid becoming entangled with the political agitations, which become more and more engrossing, and more and more nearly affect the Church. The laity, therefore, are more and more bound to look to the Church for the strength and counsel which they require, to do all things on right principle and in the fear of God, that He may prosper the State; and to watch over the temporal interests of the Church as though they were their own, knowing that in the welfare and security of the Church their own stability as a nation is involved. And the clergy also are bound to feel themselves one with the people to whom they minister in spiritual things, not standing aloof as a separate class—not mistrusting the laity as though the temporal interests of the Church would not be safe in the hands of the laity; but labouring incessantly and full of faith in their high and heavenly calling, addressing themselves to the moral being of

man, and implanting there those principles of truth which, beginning in the fear of God, are the beginning of wisdom, and in their issues manifest nothing short of good-will towards men. Thus clergy and laity may co-operate without encroaching on each others province.

Much has been said of late on the desirableness of reviving the ancient powers of the convocation, and bringing the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England under review, with the hope of producing greater unanimity amongst us, and increasing thereby the influence and efficiency of the clergy. We confess that the contrary effect appears to us likely to follow such a step, and that we should be inclined to deprecate rather than recommend it. We believe that there is substantial unity among all the honest members of the Church of England on all those points on which our Church requires unity—namely, on points essential to salvation, and which are laid down as such in the ancient Creeds and in the Articles and Canons of our Church. And we maintain that none of these essentials are departed from, nor is any addition made to them by the liturgy or rubrics of the Church of England, provided these are interpreted according to the meaning of those who compiled the services, and as they intended them to be understood by all who used the Prayer Book. It is in matters not essential to salvation that the disputes which trouble the Church have arisen, or on points which have not been so positively determined as to preclude the possibility of two opinions. Some of the disputes have turned upon the use of the surplice, and altars, and bowings, and crossings, and intonations, or similar external things, which are only the paraphernalia and accidents of worship; and others have been on the meaning of sacraments, regeneration, &c., on which points we are quite sure that those who dispute are both partly right and partly wrong; for it depends upon the colour of a man's theology.

In neither case would any good purpose be answered by discussion; for charity and mutual forbearance is the way of peace. The rule laid down by St. Paul concerning things offered to idols is exactly in point; for the idolatrous tendencies of these external ceremonies, alleged by one party, denied by the other, is the ground of the modern dispute; and, as St. Paul says of the meat offered to idols, that it is but a creature of God and that the idol is nothing; wherefore, whatever is sold in the shambles may be eaten without scruple, giving God thanks: so though we may not approve of these ceremonies introduced recently into many churches, we may,

in charity, presume that they are not used idolatrously, and tolerate the use of them by others whom we can still regard as brethren. But as, on the other hand, St. Paul enjoins them to abstain from the meat offered to idols, however harmless in itself, if by eating a weak brother would be offended or stumbled—so it is our duty to abstain from ceremonies which may be in themselves harmless if they are associated in the minds of others with idolatrous practices, and render us liable in their opinion to the charge of idolatry. "Take heed lest, by any means, this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth" (1 Cor. viii).

And, in the second case—of disputed interpretations of the services or rubrics in the Prayer Book—we should be still less expecting any good result from controversial discussions. The questions themselves are deeper and more difficult: they require to be stated calmly, in language every word of which has been very carefully weighed and considered: they are questions, therefore, better fitted for the quiet meditation of the student who works out his convictions in writing, and commits himself to nothing which he does not believe that he shall be able fully to maintain, rather than for the *viva voce* and off-hand occasions which a convocation would afford; under the excitement of which a man might irretrievably hazard assertions which, in his sober moments, he might find it difficult to stand to. Moreover, all these questions have already been discussed in the writings of the reformers and of our forefathers; and, if the weighty words and masterly arguments of those great men have failed to produce unanimity, we do not think it reasonable to expect that it would be brought about extemporaneously by confessedly feebler instruments.

Nor are we yet persuaded that any great good would result from such kind of unanimity as would be attained if the proposal were successful; for it would rather be a compromise by sacrificing some portion of truth on each side, instead of the acquisition of a larger measure of truth by either. In this, our imperfect condition, God overrules this mixed state of things by working as frequently by means of antagonism and seeming opposites as by constant harmony. Each man, as an individual, has a special duty to perform, which becomes peculiarly his own in consequence of something peculiar in him—something which differences him from all other men. St. Paul applies this to the Church, and uses an illustration

taken from the human body, showing that each member is unlike every other member, because each has an office which no other member can fulfil; and that this diversity is the strongest bond of unity, because it renders co-operation mutual, and reciprocal help from each other indispensable. "And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you" (1 Cor. xii. 21). And, in like manner, diversities of mental character, by which the many-sided forms of truth may be brought out more strikingly, impress the truth upon minds of all the various classes of which society consists—some forms of the truth taking hold of one class of men—other forms on a different constitution of mind; and, where these differences are maintained in charity, truth is advanced thereby.

Our Church has recently passed through a very severe ordeal, which at one time gave reason to apprehend the most disastrous schisms. By the secession, however, of some of the farthest gone in error, and by the awakening of others to the natural consequences of these errors, and the wholesome reaction in the rest, we may now regard the danger as subsiding, and may hope that its permanent effects will be rousing some to increased earnestness and diligence, and producing greater circumspection and vigilance in all. We reckon it as not the least omen for good that the Bishop of Chester should have been raised to the metropolitan dignity; who, in the diligent discharge of the duties of the episcopate, had won the admiration of all in the diocese; and, by the uniform kindness and urbanity of his deportment, gained the affections of all who had the privilege of approach either as clergy or laity. The elevation of such a man to the archiepiscopate has given universal satisfaction; and the few incidents which have since occurred tend to encourage the hope that it is a circumstance which will operate in no small degree to allay and calm down the remaining acerbity, and pour oil into the wounds which the recent controversies have occasioned. We quote with satisfaction that portion of the address to her Majesty recently presented by the convocation which makes reference to this subject:—"If on any occasion it should be your Majesty's pleasure, as we earnestly pray it may be, to require the advice of this synod, in devising means for increasing the efficiency of its Church, it will be our humble endeavour to conduct our deliberations with moderation and prudence, with a becoming zeal for the truth of our holy religion, tempered by a constant regard for peace and charity." These words indicate a just apprehension of the dangers to which we are adverting, at the

same time that they afford evidence that they are continually lessening in the wider diffusion of the healing principles of Christian meekness and charity. If it can ever become safe to allow the Church of England to meet in convocation for the dispatch of business, we think that it will be so under our present metropolitan; but it is a step which cannot be hastily resolved upon, nor without the fullest consideration of the range of subjects which may legitimately be brought under deliberation, and what steps are to follow in any possible contingency; and the longer it is delayed, to allow full time for examining the question in all its bearings, the more hope will there be of men becoming fully prepared, both in spirit and understanding, for fulfilling the expectations, held out in the address, of moderation and prudence; and of tempering, by a constant regard for peace and charity, that zeal which is becoming every Christian for the truth of our holy religion.

ART. II.—*The Ministry of the Body.* By the Rev. ROBERT WILSON EVANS, B.D., Vicar of Heversham, Westmoreland, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Author of "The Rectory of Valehead," &c. London: 1847.

THE only credible account of the origin and formation of man is to be found in one of the earliest extant literary records:—"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (Genesis ii. 7). The *primâ facie* evidence that this descriptive account is *authoritative* seems to us to be irresistible, as no competent reader of the Mosaic records will believe that they were composed under the lights of human science. Indeed, the attacks made upon their author by infidels, on the ground of his ignorance of physical science, saves us the trouble of endeavouring to establish this point: and yet we offer the alternative that this account of the origin of man must have been discovered either by a divine revelation or by scientific investigations; for we cannot persuade ourselves to regard it as possible that any superficial examination of the human body, before the dawn of formal science, could have suggested the fact that *all* its parts were composed of the *same* materials as the surrounding earthly objects. The discovery that the body is a part of the great system of external nature—

the same mechanically and chemically, living and decaying like all other living things—must surely be assigned to revelation or higher science. The mere observation of a dead body, which had been left to the action of the elements, would conduct to the discovery that its bones would ere long moulder away, and become hardly distinguishable from the surrounding portions of earth. But that *all* the component parts of a human body —flesh, nerves, bones, blood, &c.—should, according to proved natural laws, become decomposed into terrestrial elements, could not, it seems self-evident, be so determined by an unscientific observer in the primitive ages of the world as to lead to such a confident affirmation of its elementary composition as that formally put forth by Moses. Chemical analysis could alone *prove* that the human body in all its parts is made up of the materials of which our globe is constituted. Unless, therefore, the writer of the book of Genesis can be supposed to have been master of such a chemical analysis as has enabled subsequent physiologists to *prove* that this is the actual constitution of the human body, it must be granted that he was taught it in some other way: and, as we deem it quite incredible that there was any depositary of higher earthly knowledge of his times than the writer of this book, we conclude confidently that the authority which made the discovery and emboldened him to put it forth—not as an hypothesis, but as a certain truth—that man's body is made of the "dust of the ground," was God.

Hence, then, as scientific investigations have *proved* that the *first* part—the only one within the limits of science—of this description of humanity—viz., that man's entire body is substantially made of the "dust of the ground" is true, and could not, in those early times, have been a scientific discovery; therefore, we conclude that the latter part of this description—which, being beyond the limits of science, must have been revealed—is also true—namely, that the invisible *ens* which vitalizes this compound of earthly materials is what is called the soul, or spirit: so that the highest generalization of man is still that put forth by Moses, and has not been advanced by any subsequent investigations. The achievements of science have proved that these words of an unscientific writer concerning the human body express a perfect truth; and the most careful experiences of all subsequent generations—the only mode of testing its truth—confirm the latter. This simple division of man into body and soul seems in the best manner to serve all those practical views which regard the past, present, and future of individual history. It regards him as consisting of the

perishable (popularly speaking) substance, body, and of the imperishable *ens*, soul; each being considered as a whole, divisible into its elementary functions, and to be dealt with, in the contemplation of certain revealed final issues, as separate wholes. The deductions from these facts supply the only reasonable solution of some of the most interesting problems of human life.

For our own immediate purpose, we think this simple division less encumbered with difficulties than the one adopted by Mr. Evans and others, as if St. Paul intended to give a perfect definition of man in the terms "spirit, soul, and body" (1 Thess. v. 2, 3.) This, as is well known, was the doctrine of the Pythagoreans, Platonists, and Stoics, and may find respectable support from metaphysics and word-criticism. Macknight's solution, however, of this kind of phraseology is so frequently used in defence of similar modes of speaking in the sacred writers that it may be quoted in defence of the popular view:—"The apostle's design was to teach mankind religion and not philosophy: he might use the popular language to which the Thessalonians were accustomed, without adopting the philosophy on which that language was founded; consequently, that his prayer means no more but that they might be thoroughly sanctified, of how many constituent parts howsoever their nature consisted." It is no part, however, of our purpose to discuss the question whether men and animals alike consist of body and *soul*, the highest difference being constituted by the addition to the former of *spirit*. We remark only, that we do not lay much stress upon the criticism which extracts *definitions* from Gen. i. 26, and ii. 7, as it might tend to the conclusion that, for however brief a period, man was created without spirit—that is, he was merely an animal. We fear, moreover, that it would require much profitless trouble to attempt to make clear to our people this elementary piece of metaphysics as explained by Mr. Evans, and still more to purge our best theology of the old nomenclature. For our own practical purposes, of putting forth some remarks upon the relative importance of the component parts of man, the old division, therefore, seems sufficient. Moreover, we shall thus escape the inconvenient enquiry as to whether the soul and spirit are of the same *nature* or not. When looking upon a human skeleton, we see the fate of one of these three component parts—the body. Of another, we only know by revelation that the spirit is gone to God that gave it. But what has become to the נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, the ψυχη, the soul? How shall we explain the doctrine of this verse: "Who knoweth the spirit (רוּחַ) of a man that goeth upward, and the spirit (רוּחַ) of the

beast that goeth downward to the earth?" (Eccles. iii. 21.) This רוּחַ must be of the *nature* either of the body or the spirit. If it belongs to the former, it must perish with it; and if it belongs to the latter, it still survives; and then does not that of animalculæ, &c., also? We would, therefore, still retain the old division, in endeavouring to assign the relative positions of the bodily and the spiritual during their earthly probation, though we are very far from regarding the question as unimportant, or from insinuating that Mr. Evans has not written ably upon it.

In examining the ulterior grounds of the necessity for the sanctification of the body, it seems requisite, *in limine*, to allude to the *popular* difficulties presented by the doctrine of its future resurrection. It must be acknowledged that there seems to be a degree of impertinence, so to speak, in demanding the literalities of this doctrine, which conscious ignorance usually foregoes in speaking of the future destinies of the soul. Fools, to be sure, rush in where angels fear to tread; but whilst it is useless to notice their exceptions, the rule is to believe that after death the soul exists somewhere separately from the body, waiting the arrival of the period appointed for their re-union, by what is called the *resurrection* of the latter. But the impertinent enquiry now, as of old, is, "*How* are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" It is not long since a difficulty was suggested to us, from no unfriendly quarter, as to the impossibility of any popular or reasonable interpretation of the term *resurrection*, by pointing out the fact that human bodies are imported from foreign graveyards into England to be ground into bone-dust for agricultural purposes. We were told that this difficulty presses heavily upon the minds of some thinking serious persons who have observed this fact, and drawn their own conclusions from it. For how, it is asked, can any distinction be made under such circumstances? Indeed, our churchyards and cemeteries seem not unnaturally to suggest the idea of *ownership;* and we ourselves knew a pious lady, of family rank, who expressed a desire that her coffin might be deposited in the grave with its lid unscrewed, that no impediment might exist in the way of her instant obedience to the summons of the archangel's trump! If this marks a state of ignorance not unmixed with irreverence, yet does it also exhibit that popular notion of ownership at the resurrection, which, we fear, makes many secret doubters or unbelievers. To the friend who suggested to us the above popular difficulty, we replied at the time by pointing out the gross absurdity of predicating the limits of time and space of Him who fabricated those rolling orbs over

our own heads, and of presenting the apparent difficulties of a paltry sheet of salt water before Him "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance" (Isaiah xl. 12).

But there is another solution which may help to free the subject from all such literal difficulties. Amongst other purposes which the materials of our globe are designed to serve, one is for the fabrication of the human body. We have shown it to be a point of revelation that Adam's body was made of these pre-existing materials: nor can we believe that, chemically speaking, none but those identical portions which were actually made use of could have produced that organized frame with all its constitutional peculiarities. We cannot bring ourselves to imagine that any peculiarity exists in the decomposed materials of any two human bodies to constitute essential identity—that is, that there is something essentially peculiar in the "dust" of one which there is not in that of the other. The actual and distinctive *framework* of Adam and of every human being is something real, and altogether arbitrary of any parental arrangements; but we do not suppose that the "dust" of one might not serve the purpose of the re-organization of another, if re-animation were required. Certainly, this hypothesis presents no practical difficulties to the reason, though the *peculiarities* of individual physical organization present such as might be fairly used to show abstractedly the limits of even guessing. The colour of the complexion and the hair, and those nameless differences where even the strongest family likeness between brother and brother is seen upon close investigation being but superficial, manifest a contriving power that rules with perfect mastery a complicated and subtle machinery, which, though limited to our knowledge, is yet thus proved to be unlimited in its appliances; but still, it is beyond the power of human science to prove that these differences and varieties depend in any way upon the qualities of such definite earthly materials as could be replaced, in individual cases, by no others. Personal identity, we think, may depend more upon the filling up of that peculiar *mould*, which is an universal *differentia* of individuals, than upon any native difference between the "dust" which may be taken up in one hand from a church-yard in England, and in the other from a burial-ground in any country across the seas. We should judge it to be far more likely that it is the original and distinctive mould, constituting, as has been said, an universal *differentia*, which deter-

mines such definite characteristics of individuals, as the relative quantity of blood, the disposition of the nerves, &c., than any distinguishing qualities of the mere earthly materials which fill out these moulds. So far as this theory is probable, so far are we justified in rejecting the popular difficulties raised upon the doctrine of the resurrection, on the ground of the apparent *impossibility* of restoring to each that identical body he laid down at death; for, until it can be proved that the individual's bodily identity depends upon the inherent qualities, and not, as we judge, upon the disposition only of the earthly materials of which it is composed, the popular difficulty rests upon no foundation. We deem it quite enough to say that, as the human frame is composed of earthly materials in general, when the soul of each requires for its body that exact quantity which shall suffice to constitute its former identity, according to the original mould, not a single difficulty will exist on the ground of ownership, unless it can be proved that one portion of earth, or air, or water, is generically different from, and better or worse than another.

We may further illustrate this view by asking whether it is supposable that the physical organization of an individual, who had been reared from infancy to manhood in one locality, would have been in any way different, if he had been reared in a locality twenty miles distant? And yet it is certain that the precise earthly materials of which the body would have been formed in the one case would be different from those of which it would have been formed in the other. Our conclusion from this is the same as before—that personal identity does not depend upon the quality of earthly materials, but rather, as we are led to suppose, upon some definite quantity taken according to no rule of what we call ownership, and the composition of it into wholes after given moulds.

As to the physical difficulties which are presented to some minds by what are deemed mechanical impossibilities, the whole must disappear before sober views of the miraculous (according to our present laws) powers which the general resurrection implies. For though it is contrary to any laws with which we are now acquainted, yet, upon our introduction at death into new departments of the universe, the circumstances of the resurrection will appear then as natural as the conception, birth, and growth to manhood of individuals does now. Indeed, such we are sure will be the case; for it is certain that the laws under which the inhabitants of this globe are to exist hereafter have not now to be enacted, or changed, or repealed. His laws are, like himself, unchangeable. One of these laws experience has established that the spirit of man should be clothed for a definite

period in a material dress, which shall be capable of certain functions, and then be dissolved into the "dust" from whence it was taken. Another law has been revealed concerning the future, that after a period of separation the soul shall be again united to an earthly body, on which divine power shall effect such transforming changes as shall qualify it for some new definite position and duties in the universe, which, though clearly alluded to, are yet veiled under negations and images.

Attempts have been made to get rid of the physical difficulties suggested by the apparent impossibility of a restoration to each soul of the identical body actually laid down at death, by supposing some germ to exist in it, which, like other seeds, would contain within itself the miniature body to be enlarged by growth or some other unknown means. If, however, this idea were received and carried out, it would tend to a result similar to our own, only encumbered with the difficulty of conceiving how that germ, and myriads of others, could be preserved from sharing the fate of their kindred dust.

We would fain hope that the theory we have sketched might be made use of for allaying those painful doubts about the possibility of the future resurrection which have arisen in certain minds from the proved fact that portions of earth, which belonged to one human body, must have been converted by the processes of nature into materials appropriated by another; and, as these processes can be carried on without assignable limit, ownership must be out of the question. Our hypothesis tends to set aside all such difficulties, by showing that they are unfounded in nature.

But upon this view, that sacred regard for *our own* body, which is the main purpose of Mr. Evans's book to inculcate, may seem unnecessary, as it is to be manifested towards materials *none* of which may fall to our share at the resurrection. We might at once cut this knot by a reference to our former remark upon the impertinence of demanding the literalities of a *fact*, which has been revealed without its *modes*. But a similar objection belongs to personal identity after the lapse of years; for, as Bishop Butler observes of "large quantities of matter in which we are very nearly interested," they "may be alienated, and actually are in the course of succession, and changing their owners, whilst we are assured that each living agent remains one and the same permanent being."* But one remark (it is impossible to discuss such a subject in the pages of a *Review*) may suffice. In demanding peculiar veneration either for soul or body, the

* Analogy, part i., chap. i., sect. ii.

true foundation of the respect must be made to rest upon their divine origin and revealed destiny. When, therefore, we urge the solemn duty of using our bodies as "vessels of sanctification and honour," we imply that they are a specific kind of divine workmanship, which, after its earthly destiny has been fulfilled, we believe will, *to all intents and purposes*, be restored identically at the resurrection; for if the entire change of substance, which occurs after the lapse of many years, during the earthly existence, does not destroy the peculiarities of identity, why should any such entire changes at the resurrection destroy it? The body of our blessed Lord was certainly raised with the peculiarities which had marked it during his former life, otherwise his disciples and friends would have been unable to establish his identity. Indeed, we know it bore even the scars of the crucifixion: nor can we believe that that sacred body presented after its resurrection its former emaciated appearance, occasioned by such sufferings in life and on the cross as must have reduced it to the minimum of size compatible with existence. We speak with reverence; but there can be no doubt that this view is true.

In like manner, as Christ's resurrection is to be the pattern of ours, so we conclude will each individual body, of whatever materials it is composed, exhibit after its resurrection those natural and original peculiarities which distinguished it from the myriads of others scattered over all the generations of time; and, to our apprehension, this characteristic physical re-organization appears to be altogether independent of the popular requirement that the materials of the heavenly body should be taken from the burial-ground of the earthly body. The potter hath power over clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another to dishonour; but the same clay which was used to make the vessel unto dishonour would have served equally well to make the vessel unto honour. Just, then, as the sameness of the materials of two vessels made from clay of the same lump does not constitute their identity, no more, as it appears to us, will the sameness of the materials be required to constitute personal identity at the resurrection. This has already received an illustration from the consideration that the sameness of the materials does not constitute the personal identity of an individual at any two consecutive periods, since, by the ceaseless natural processes of rejection and addition, which are going on in all human bodies, interchanges must occur periodically. Hence this objection to especial sanctification of the earthly body, on the ground of (possibly) total changes in the materials of the heavenly body, is without force.

But it is time to pass on from principles to their application. There can be no doubt that the religious views of the compound man presented by our popular theology are mainly limited to what is called the soul. We cannot, as we write this, recall to our remembrance one of our own acquaintances, educated or uneducated, who entertains any such definite views of the "ministry of the body" as are explained and defended by Mr. Evans. If we desired to embody the vague notions of the place assigned to the human body in the popular creed, we should say that it is regarded as the clog of the soul—its encumbrance; or, treating it with a little more respect, as the scaffolding of the building, which not only forms no part of it, but disfigures it, and therefore must be thrown down as soon as its purposes have been served. The enquiry, however, is seldom instituted, *how* the body has been made a clog and an impediment, if such it is felt to be. "Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano." * He who, by following the laws of nature and revelation, has obtained this answer to prayer will never speak thus wickedly of that divine workmanship, the human body. The lines following the above verse will partly explain what we mean: nor needs the Christian misinterpret us in adding the following:—

> "Monstro quod ipsi tibi possis dare: semita certe
> Tranquillæ per virtutem patet unica vitæ.
> Nullum Numen habes, si sit *prudentia*."

The Stagyrite teaches us that *prudence* is the progenitor of all the virtues; and, with comparatively few exceptions, it will be found that imprudence in earlier years in overtaxing the body, whether as students or as pursuers of gain or pleasure, is the sole cause of its being *felt* to be a clog and a wearying burden, instead of a perpetual source of boundless gratitude. The joy with which a body in perfect health responds at times to the appeals of nature abroad is known to none but such as have carefully used it according to the divine laws. It is said by the biographer of the poet Crabbe that he could never read steadily those lines of Shakspeare's good old Adam:—

> "Though I look old, yet am I strong and lusty;
> For in my youth I never did apply
> Hot and rebellious liquors to my blood;
> Nor did I with unbashful forehead woo
> The means of weakness and debility.
> Therefore, my age is as a lusty winter,
> Frosty, but kindly."

* Juvenal, Sat. x. 356.

Such as these can never miscall the body a clog and an encumbrance. It is impossible, however, to say how much evil has been and is wrought by such utterly erroneous views of the mystical union of the body and soul, and of the separate claims of each. Perhaps, therefore, we are justified in attributing great importance to Mr. Evans's contribution to our theological literature, though we are far from coinciding with all his theories and their application. We think the time has arrived when the real errors and the imperfect views which have so long made certain portions of our popular theology a stumbling block to the thoughtful should be canvassed by higher minds, and the results put forth in a popular form. None but ministers can tell the difficulty of disabusing the minds of the ignorant of the erroneous opinions which are so confidently and dogmatically put forth by certain self-called teachers.

Mr. Evans commences his work with some remarks which serve so well to explain his views that we quote them at some length :—

"To be in the body, what a mystery! To exercise its senses, what a blessing! To rule its appetites, what a charge! Our future state will be a bodily one; and, therefore, it surely seems not unreasonable to suppose that our purest bodily enjoyment may contain the seed of that future enjoyment, even as the present body contains the seed of the future body. The day, indeed, will come in which all the splendid host and beautiful array of nature's objects shall vanish away; but shall we weep, therefore, as did that fond Persian king, over the magnificent spectacle of his mortal armies? On the contrary, as life suggested death to him, so the mute insensibility of these preaches of life to our hearts. Then it is not dumb and unmeaning, whatever it may be to eye or ear: it then whispers, 'Body thou art, and body thou wilt be; and, therefore, bodily things, however highly refined towards spiritual, will always be among the objects of thy contemplation.' Are you sufficiently aware of this? Are not you, and almost all men, unduly prejudiced in favour of an independent existence? You might not express yourselves to this purport in direct terms, though, by the way, your language strongly savours of it. Yet do you consciously and regularly carry the notion of body into that world which you are contemplating in spirit? Do you not rather imagine that the first thing to be done in such a contemplation is to divest yourself as much as possible of all bodily consciousness, and remove from you, as far as you can, all corporeal reference? And are you not thus fixing your attention merely on the intermediate, and not on the fixed, state of your nature?"

Mr. Evans thus continues :—

"I, for one, must plead guilty to this charge. On looking back to past thoughts and recurring to former expressions, I cannot but detect

the inaccuracy which arises from such insufficient consideration. And conversation and books assure me that I am but one of a multitude—that it is difficult to find one by whom the body is duly kept in sight; and yet to it, after all our aspirations, we must come at last. However we may flutter and flatter ourselves with flying, we are but like the bird going the length of the chain that is fastened to the top of the pole on which he is perched. All erroneous systems have concurred in undervaluing its rank. Thus the Gnostic learned to do from the speculations of Greek and Oriental philosophy. And is not our stage of society much the same? Is not the popular mind similarly affected towards undue spiritualism? And are we not all apt to acquiesce in the language and notions of our times on all those points which have not drawn to them our particular attention? Not, indeed, that any have come, or seem likely to come, to that pass, that they should neglect its rights after the fashion of those old heretics who systematically and spitefully macerated it as the corrupter of the soul; or, on the contrary, abused it to all uncleanness, as a vile thing to be vilely used."

In illustration of the popular errors he proceeds thus:—

"Let us examine our common language, even when it is uttered from the pulpit, whence it should come forth in its greatest accuracy. How seldom does the mention of the body occur in the announcements of the life to come? They may, indeed, so far be accurate enough, inasmuch as they follow the scriptural example in declaring the salvation of the soul. But is this the whole, and therefore undefiled, truth of that example? Does not Scripture also speak of the salvation of the body? Does not St. Paul also mention the redemption of the body in company with the adoption of the spirit,* and exhort to heavenly conversation through the prospect of the future conformity of the body to the glorious body of Christ?† Yet our popular language is utterly unqualified by any expressions like these. It is even inconsistent with them: for who could possibly infer from its cast that there was to be anything in man in the world to come besides his soul? Mortal body and immortal soul are so pointedly and continually set in mutual contrast, assigned to different lots, that all view of the future life of the former seems to be absorbed in the exclusive nature of the eternal state of the latter. How strange does such omission appear when we turn round from such preaching, and hear our Lord warning us that not only our soul but our body also may be destroyed in hell;‡ and his apostle ordering an offender to be delivered unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus? Here are other elements besides the soul to be taken into the account" (p. 6, 7).

Mr. Evans proceeds to enumerate some of the evils resulting from these erroneous views, such as the not giving their proper fulness and reality to those "four grand cardinal doctrines of

* Rom. viii. 23. † Phil. iii. 21. ‡ Matt. x. 28.

our creed, the visibility of the Church, Christ's intercession in his human body in heaven, the resurrection of the body, and the future judgment."

We have already attempted to dispose of some difficulties attaching themselves to the *popular* view of the doctrines of the resurrection; but still more severe difficulties surround the awful and sublime creed of the Church concerning the intercession of our blessed Lord in his human body in heaven. In the hope of relieving some minds, however slightly, we will endeavour to exhibit a few of the strong points of this fact.

Our blessed Lord Jesus Christ, as the Son of Man, is a historical character, amenable to the laws of human knowledge. During his earthly career, therefore, he fulfilled such functions of humanity as put him upon a level with ourselves: he ate, drank, slept, talked, wept; and, up to the moment of his disappearance from the public gaze on the cross, his body presented the same appearances of humanity as the two malefactors who were crucified with him, with the further physical proofs of actual life and death manifested by the "blood and water" that flowed from his pierced side; and after his resurrection he afforded similar proofs of his terrestrial human nature by walking, eating, and discoursing. One of his disciples, too, was invited to obtain the evidences of at least two of the senses, the eye and the touch, in those plain words addressed by our Lord to Thomas—"Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God" (John xx. 27-29). On Mount Olivet he conversed with his disciples as a man with men; and "while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight" (Acts i. 9). In his bodily form he was seen to enter the cloud. Up to the very point, therefore, to which it was possible for the human senses to follow him, he wore the human form. These circumstances, which are supported by human evidence, give their strong support to the rest, which depends upon divine evidences. All is satisfactory as far as human faculties can trace facts; and beyond that precise boundary line, drawn by the necessity of the case, reason hands it over with just confidence to faith. Nothing, indeed, can be more satisfactory than the evidence of his ascent up to heaven in the bodily form up to the extremest limit at which such a fact could be cognizable by human senses. Of course the Church's creed rests upon pure revelation; but still we rejoice to know that reason powerfully lends her aid in this case, so as to impose a lighter burden upon faith. In ap-

portioning the division of the fourth Article of the Church between reason and faith; *reason* claims this share—"Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven;" and *faith* claims only this share—"and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men at the last day." We admit, of course, that the *modus existendi et operandi* is as much beyond the reach of the understanding as that of angels, or of God himself. But the fact itself and its results are certain, though every link of the chain which connects them together is stretched along a valley of impenetrable darkness. But is not this also true of the *modus operandi* of a natural fact? The fact of a grain of corn buried in the earth and the multitudinous results are bound by a chain as invisible to human eye as that which binds together the heavenly manhood of Jesus Christ with its multitudinous results exhibited in the nourishment of the Church militant here on earth.

We have written thus, because it is the revealed future destiny of both body and soul that gives awful sanction to those laws which confine within strict limits the operations of both whilst on this earthly stage of their existence. The laws which are published for ruling the body are at least as clear as those respecting the soul. If the body is for ever to be dissolved then is there no resurrection of the dead, and "if there be no resurrection of the dead then is not Christ raised; but Christ is risen from the dead," and therefore so shall his followers rise. But the word "resurrection" is literally applicable to the body only. Whatever dignity, therefore, belongs to this word is shared as much at least by the body as the soul, since the nomenclature itself refers to the former only. How, then, can the training of the body for its future destiny be a less honourable and peculiar work than that of the soul? The resurrection of Christ's body is to be the pattern of that of his followers: they are hereafter to be like him, for they shall see him as he is. And when the trump shall sound, and the dead in Christ shall have risen first, then shall the quick be caught up with them to meet the Lord in the air, having undergone a change of which probably his own afforded the pattern on its ascent from Mount Olivet, and which therefore will be the pattern of the new-raised bodies. The importance of the human body, which this view of its ultimate destination presents before the mind, cannot be easily overvalued. He who can clearly exhibit it as the starting point of his argument will enlist on his side such awful views as cannot fail of paving the way for the success of his

continued appeals to obtain for it a permanent place amongst the governing principles of the Christian's life.

Mr. Evans assigns three causes for "the unhealthy state of the public mind at this day" as to the subject before us. The first is, that the popular knowledge of such a copious subject, which was demanded at the Reformation, implies a very compressed abridgment. Not only, therefore, were all the more learned works of antiquity to be set aside, but also the single volume of Scripture must be abridged. This could only be made by undue abstraction—that is, by spiritualism, which, as a system, left out all proper consideration for the body. Hence, in the popular theology, the resurrection of the body is lost in the immortality of the soul. The second is somewhat kindred with this. The third is attributed to the reaction from popery. Nothing could be more grossly material than popular popery before the Reformation; and hence, in running into extremes, as is usually the case with violent opponents, the evils of pure spiritualism would be necessarily generated. Any one may be able to realise this by considering the horror still entertained amongst certain classes of *any* peculiar observances which are found in the Romish Church. It is a sufficient proof with such of their falsehood, and a valid reason for their rejection, that they *are* found there, regarding that as a test of truth which supersedes the necessity of investigating whether they found support from Scripture or not. Hence, as Mr. Evans notes, some of the modern conversions to popery may be accounted for:—

"No position is found so irksome—and, therefore, deemed so little worth the trouble of maintaining—by the idle and bustling spirits which such times foster, as that which is at rest between the vibratory notions which agitate with increasing activity to the very opposite extremes of truth. To maintain it requires a knowledge of the critical points which lie between—a constant vigilance against undue preponderance—a careful balance of adverse claims by patient investigation—a firm moderation in assigning to either side its proper portion of right. It calls for attention, and not agitation—for observation, and not curiosity—for a standing and not a running fight—for an exact nomenclature and not a loose calling of names" (p. 12-13).

We must, however, give especial prominence to one advantage that may result from reducing this subject to as definite a form as it is capable of receiving. There can be no doubt that the principal source of the manifold evils that pervade all ranks of society is to be traced up to illicit *sensuality*. Men who aspire to a high character for nobility of soul, and to mental states designated by such sounding words, are often even

grossly sensual in private life. They who really feel that a falsehood or an act of dishonesty would inflict the deepest injury on their immaterial part, the soul, have yet to be taught that there are acts, of which they think lightly, which may as surely damage another element which is also a part of man's immortal whole, the body. Man's happiness and misery are complex now, depending upon the joint action of both body and soul. A healthy or unhealthy body will tend to impart its character to the soul, as a healthy or unhealthy soul will affect the body. These are axioms of our earthly existence. But the enquiry is, will all characteristics of the earthly body be so entirely effaced as in no way to affect its heavenly condition? The enquiry is solemn; and though the means of conducting it are shrouded in shade, or in darkness in which our way must be felt rather than seen, nevertheless the possible advantages of a temperate discussion of *probabilities* seem to justify us in offering some remarks upon it.

That the popular doctrine of complete pardon of sin obliterating all traces of its former effects, as taught and held by certain so-called Calvinists, is injurious to morals, cannot be denied by any one who has witnessed the consequences of this unqualified creed upon many who have embraced it. Our own frequent conversations with some whose active religious profession has constituted them Christians of higher mark in the world's judgment, upon the logical abuses of the dogmas of election and final perseverance, and our complaints of their operation in startling instances which were actually alleged as proofs, justify us in writing confidently upon this subject. "The greater the sinner the greater the saint" is one of those horrible maxims which is secretly believed by many; as well as another of great practical injury, that the character of the sins of God's people is to be illustrated by the merciful manner in which a fond father deals with a transgression in his own son, as compared with the severity shown towards a stranger. We are not putting these sayings in the mouths of the truly sincere (who in fact never employ them), but of such as are seeking to justify conduct incompatible with the straightforward demands of Christianity, which are the highest forms, to say the least, of personal purity and morality.

The enquiry suggested by us, in the hope of offering some correcting views of the palpable evils of such lax and absurd opinions, is, as to the *permanent* effect upon the body or soul, or both, of certain *sins*—that is, of deviations from established *laws*, framed according to the natural constitution of either, and which, therefore, *cannot* be violated without positive in-

jury, certainly temporary, and possibly permanent. The popular theology puts forth, as an unqualified proposition, the perfect happiness of the redeemed in heaven, as the result of perfect forgiveness; and, in this way of speaking, all the past evils of our lives are to disappear for ever. Of course, we raise no doubts upon the scriptural view of perfect forgiveness: we only object to such a naked mode of putting it forward as shall offer encouragement, not to say a premium, for sin.

Abstract perfection can be predicated of God only—in all other cases it is relative. We can conceive of the perfect happiness of the infant, the child, the boy, the grown man, and the aged man; perfect—that is, as being free from all the evils possible to and incidental to their separate conditions; and perfect, as being neither above nor below the capacity bestowed upon each by nature—*e. g.*, the joy which is so great as to break forth into tears we should not call perfect happiness. So the happiness of a blind man may be perfect according to his circumstances—that is, when he is quite resigned to living without the enjoyments of sight, as to a lot ordered, whether punitively or otherwise,* by him who, he is conscious, cannot but act towards him from motives of love. And yet such a perfection of happiness cannot be compared with his, who, being in other respects this man's equal, is blessed with the advantages of sight. These illustrations are designed to afford suggestions only to aid the enquiry, whether it is improbable or impossible that a body which dissipation has permanently injured during its earthly probation, and consigned to days of almost uselessness and pain, will for ever at death lose all traces of the past? Is it certain that this radically damaged body will be raised up with all the effects of these evils for ever obliterated? Though some may choose to call such a question almost profane, yet we must propose it. Could we complain, if the body of one who, through life, consulted and acted upon the laws of nature and revelation in using it, should not be precisely circumstanced hereafter with his who prematurely corrupted or destroyed it in this world, by refusing to regulate its uses by laws either natural or revealed? It is certain that the forgiveness of God does not repair these evils in this life; will he, therefore, be required to blot out for ever all traces of them in the next condition of mankind, and so to leave no visible difference between him who used his earthly gift in advancing the good of his fellow-creatures and him who used it in destroying the bodies and souls of the victims of his vices? For if we

* See John ix. 2, 3.

flinch not from taking in all the views which the subject presents, we must add this—many a true penitent has to look back upon individuals who have passed from the stage of life without one symptom of the spiritual change undergone by himself, and to whose premature death, and to the corruption of their bodies and souls that led to it, he was the first and direct minister. That the material and immaterial elements of his own being, too, had undergone many deteriorating changes in this world, in consequence of these vices, was visible to all. Must we, then, believe it to be impossible that no traces of all this will exist in the restored body? It seems quite incredible that there should not be differences as manifold in the second state of our existence as there are in the first. Which, then, is most agreeable to our notions of the righteous dealings of God, that these differences should be arbitrary, or that they should proceed according to laws founded upon our earthly probation? The popular notion is, that there will be differences, but that they will be spiritual ones only; but why not physical ones also? If the *spiritual* advantages of Abraham in the other world will doubtless exceed those of the repentant sensualist, why may not the *physical* advantages of the patriarch there, founded upon the body uncorrupted by vices in its earthly probation, exceed also those of the same man founded upon his body corrupted during its earthly probation? We are prepared for the ready answer furnished by the false logic of the parable. For can it in any practical sense be taken literally of two individuals, that he who has worked the whole day, and whose wearied body demands repose as the sole condition of its being able to work to-morrow, should be dealt with as he who began to labour only at the eleventh hour; and who, therefore, at least, cannot be weary and does not need repose? If questions imply much ignorance—and we are deeply conscious of ours—they also imply some knowledge; as the man who asks absurd questions about the inhabitants of the moon gives evidence that he, at least, *knows* that there is a moon: and so, if we are asked to give a direct answer to the question—do you believe that the temporal effects of crime upon the temporal body will, in some way, not wholly disappear from the glorified body?—we must reply, we can prove nothing, though we affirm that the question is founded upon some knowledge which not unnaturally led to it. And our angry adversary must make the same confession of ignorance in his reply to our enquiry, involving a supposition that the chaste and the unchaste body may be possibly distinguished from each other by some corresponding marks, which, though real, yet shall not interfere

with the perfect happiness of each, according to its relative capacity for it. It is not usually supposed that the scars which certainly appeared in the risen body of our blessed Lord are obliterated in his glorified body: indeed, the popular creed, as embodied in a hymn which is confidently sung by thousands, assumes the fact:—

> "See where he stands at thy right hand,
> And pours the interceding prayer,
> Points to his hands, and shows his side,
> And says that I am graven there."

This (supposed) *fact* proves that the body does carry with it into the next state the scars of time without affecting its perfection.

We must again remark that we allude to possible and probable facts only, and not to any possible or probable *modes* of their exhibition. Of course, however, we do not suppose that the deforming appearances, superinduced upon some bodies by vice in this life, will appear so hereafter; but it is within the range of human probabilities that there may be *modes* of marking these, which shall not interfere with their assuming a place suited to them amongst heavenly bodies, as there must be some mode in which the scars of our blessed Lord are exhibited. Nor should we class such bodily imperfections as were the result of accident or of birth with those which proceeded from a vicious course; for the process by which the latter are brought about is usually slow, and therefore gradually, but thoroughly, affects the whole system.

Here we must pause, fully feeling, as we imagine the reader will, that we have ventured our frail bark far enough amidst the rocks and shoals of an unexplored sea. We ask grace for our boldness on account of the magnitude of the venture. We have been whispering some timid words and dreaming a hope that they may not altogether perish from some memory in the hour when the trembling halter between two courses—sees another law in his members warring against the law of his mind—and seeking to bring him into captivity to the law of sin which is in his members. For such we have offered an hypothesis (*non omnis morietur*), that he who lays down a body freer from the marks of gross sensuality shall have bodily advantages hereafter superior to him who laid his down covered with the tokens of a polluting career. Far, indeed, are we from dogmatizing—rather we fear and tremble. But the bare hope that our frail argument may help some struggling spirit in its courageous efforts to ward off the stains and scars of sensuality has emboldened us to put forth a theory which, if it will offend some

who may not be disinterested judges, may yet fall in good time upon the prepared and listening ear of some ακροατης ὁ νεος; and, if so, great will be our reward!

We will now offer a few specimens of Mr. Evans's work, by way of showing the pleasure and profit which may be anticipated by such as will undertake to read it. The fascination of the work is greatly enhanced by some pretty descriptions of scenery, which may lead the curious reader to speculations upon the locality of "Valehead." Indeed, those who have, like ourselves, again and again made acquaintance with the scenes and persons of that rectory in Utopia will easily recognize in these pages the old wand, and rejoice to see that it has lost none of its virtues. The second chapter opens thus:—

"Not long ago I used to attend a sick man whose house overhung the river Kent, and the chamber to which he was confined looked full upon what, in this country, is called a gill—namely, a mountain rill. It was seen leaping into the Kent from the opposite bank, with a fall shining amid dark foliage, and was heard in continual accompaniment, and neither unmusical nor impertinent did either of us think it, with our conversation, our reading, and our prayer. It seemed to say Amen—God's incessant outward working, denoted by its song, seconding with this lively symbol the sense of his continued inward working. Fresh with deep and solemn feelings and lively sympathy from this chamber of bodily suffering and spiritual rejoicing, I returned homeward through a scene of exquisite beauty and variety. After roving down a long succession of falls, and then hurrying with a darkened stream between overhanging ledges of rock, the river enters Leven's Park, and flows with a more gentle course through a lovely dingle, where the rock appears but here and there peeping through the branches of aged trees, and troops of deer are seen dashing through the fern of their wild pasture and then crossing the stream in a long file; and then, again, shaking off the wet in a light canter up the opposite bank. At the end of my walk, often have I wondered by what beginning I came upon the thoughts which I had brought home. I could, however, generally discover their fountain-head in the sick-room whence they emerged—even in my favourite stream from his still and lonely well among the fells—and took the shape of their varied course, like him, from the various scenery through which I had passed outwardly, and from the diversified ground of the heart through which they had flowed inwardly" (pp. 20, 21).

Indeed, the dreamy lover of nature may envy Mr. Evans his power of turning such luxuries to a spiritual account; or, rather, he may learn from the examples of this work how to extract, from what but too often awakens only delightful emotions, permanent lessons of wisdom.

The chapter entitled "Considerations on the Intermediate State," will show the practical uses to which the author applies

his theory. The following will explain to us how, during one of his rambles, he was led to this train of thinking:—

"In returning from one of my lecture stations, about nine in the evening, I have to cross a wide steep walk along the mountain side. In the wintry nights, when it is very dark, I commonly go a little round, and guide myself by a stone wall, from the end of which I have then scarcely a furlong to cross to enclosures again; but, if starlight will allow me, I always prefer going straight over it for the sake of enjoying the gleam of the bay, and of the river winding as bright silver under the deep shade of Whitbarrow, whose white towering cliffs are seen softly breaking the darkness: and, above them all, is the full uninterrupted expanse of heaven, holding forth its thousands of golden lamps with a brightness which, in these mountainous regions, is undimmed by vapour. These cliffs, and the shining of the moon, then form part of my guidance; and at first I often experience the fate of those who, directing their way by objects too distant, fall against or into those which are near."

This last sentence suggests the spiritual theme; and Mr. Evans thus breaks forth, with all the advantages of one whose clerical labours have enlisted our sympathies:—

"Having the present subject uppermost in my mind, it would occur to me that, in spiritual things, we are apt to look for guidance to remote, and neglect what lies before our feet. Who, then, can wonder at such stumbling as there is? We think to go by pure abstract spirit, and so far to neglect the province of the body that we find some actually laying it down as a rule that the further they go from bodily the nearer they come to spiritual. Thus they make man up of two opposite elements; and to a superficial view they do, indeed, appear opposite. One is palpable, visible, vulnerable, mortal; the other is impalpable, invisible, invulnerable, immortal. But, with all this, how is one a negation of the other? When we have in any way denied the body, do we insomuch necessarily advance into the spirit? When we starve the body, do we feed the spirit? When we humble the body, do we exalt the spirit? Such, indeed, is the doctrine of Gnosticism, Manicheism, &c., and, therefore, should be a beacon of warning to the Christian" (pp. 37, 38).

To these errors, and the popular confusion of soul and spirit (we still think that the terms *material* and *immaterial* may be made a sufficiently perfect generalization), is traced up such a loose way of speaking as this—that "while the soul is represented as ascended into heaven the moment it has departed from the body, and standing before the throne (so inconsistently material is its language) in all the perfection of human bliss." Such a mode of thinking and speaking, of course, excludes the literalities of the day of judgment, and presents it, at best, "as a day of empty parade, in which souls are to come out of

heaven and hell, in order to go back into heaven and hell." Hence also have arisen the heresies of those who consider our Lord's terrible and particular description as merely figurative. The inaccuracy of the popular language is further shown; for "in the same breath that speaks of the soul, it will speak of crowns and thrones and other bodily preparation receiving it from earth; but, when searchingly canvassed, it will be found to involve the notion that the resurrection is already past." Mr. Evans adds, that the tenet of the soul's entering heaven, before the day of the general resurrection of the dead, was a Gnostic error; and that modern Romanism is deeply interested in maintaining it, on the ground of its creed concerning the offices of the saints.

Another cause alleged by Mr. Evans, for the disappearance from our popular theology of the intermediate state, is the fear lest the Romish doctrine of purgatory should find countenance in it. The proper reply to this is, that the intermediate state is a fact of revelation (Luke xxiii. 43), whilst purgatory is a human deduction from or graft upon it. Some of the arguments, indeed, in favour of this state, here adduced, seem to us exceedingly weak and scarcely needing refutation—for example, it has been objected, says Mr. Evans, that "an intermediate state of imperfect bliss reasonably demands our prayers for its termination to those who are in it; and that the doctrine, therefore, essentially includes all the errors and abuses which flow from the Romish doctrine." It appears to us, however, to be most presumptuous—the presumption of intellects which have never ascertained the boundary line of human knowledge—to speculate upon the unrevealed *wants* or *wishes* of the disembodied spirit. Would the crucified malefactor, who found himself on the day of his death "in Paradise" instead of a place of penal banishment, thank any mortal for asking God that he might pass on to a place of more perfect felicity? If we could overcome our consciousness of the impertinence of speculating upon the unrevealed privacies of that sacred home, we should judge that the disembodied spirits find there all the happiness they are *capable* of enjoying in their isolated condition; one element of earthly misery being most certainly excluded—discontentment with their lot. Indeed, it has always appeared to us that it would be infinitely more reasonable that *they* should pray for us than that *we* should pray for them; as, whilst they well know from past experience our real wants and circumstances, we know nothing whatever of theirs. It has been said, by way of defence, that, in the burial services of our Church, there occurs a petition which justifies the practice of private prayers for the departed—"That it may please thee, of

thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect and to hasten thy kingdom." We ourselves, however, have never been accustomed to put such an interpretation upon it. According to our version of the words, they refer only to those who are of the Church militant here on earth. In uttering them we intend to pray that the changes alluded to may take place, not for the sake of those faithful ones whose souls, it is just before said, are "in joy and felicity," but for such as are still exposed to the risks of the earthly conflict; and this we believe to be the true meaning, notwithstanding Mr. Evans gives to it another.

How then, it is asked, can the body be that insignificant portion of man to which spiritualism seeks to reduce it, since the condition of the soul will be incomplete without it? Nor do the disparaging words occasionally used in the Bible towards the body justify this theory of its unworthiness; for, if St. Paul speaks of the present body as one of humiliation, yet he contrasts this state with its future conformity to the body of the glory of Christ;* and if he speaks of the dissolution of the tabernacle, which, through its sinfulness, now extorts groans, yet he speaks also of the heavenly body.† There are also definite views of the future happiness of the corporeal being which are altogether wanting to the spiritualist. Nearly all, if not all, the descriptions of the ultimate happiness of such as shall dwell in the Christian's heaven, whether set forth negatively or positively, are addressed to beings whose knowledge and enjoyments must depend upon what we now call the senses, however they will then be modified: they must have *eyes*, for they shall *see* him as he is: they must have the organs of speech, or they cannot sing the song of Moses and the Lamb: they must have *ears*, or their performance upon the golden harp will be but a dumb show: they must have *hands*, or they cannot strike the strings of their heavenly lyres. And what corporeal being can form *any* notion of a "mansion" and "a place" (John xiv. 2), unless they be such as a corporeal being must occupy? Now, let it be supposed that these inlets and instruments of our purest enjoyments and knowledge shall be expanded wide, broad, deep, and high—so that not only shall the eye take in, by means of the telescope as now, a few superficial accidents of the planet which is holding on its path at the distance of millions of miles from us, but shall then, without any such artificial aid, penetrate into its very heart and there ecstatically gaze upon such wonders of love, and power,

* Phil. iii. 21. † 2 Cor. v. 1, 2.

and beauty of the divine architect, as the revelations of this earthly planet never laid bare before his most passionate adorer; and let the future power of the *ear*, thus indefinitely expanded to convey happiness, be judged of by the bliss which it once carried to the patriarch's soul as he heard these words, "Joseph is yet alive;" and the future power of the *eye*, by the bliss which it conveyed to the soul of the same father "when he *saw* the waggons which Joseph had sent to carry him," and when he caught the first glimpse of his beloved son as the chariot in which he was riding came in sight of Goshen—all this is quite intelligible: it is only to conceive that he who has limited these powers of our present corporeal organization to suit the circumstances of this planet should place it where those powers will find no such impediments to their indefinite development and exercise, and where every evil accident, which sin has attached to it, will be for ever removed. How vastly different is all this from those vague views of the nature of future happiness which are derived from considerations of the bodiless soul? The imagery of Scripture, if applied to that alone, becomes pointless and a compound of unintelligible metaphors. If, too, through these views, one of the fellow-labourers in the earthly probation is denied his claims, then, openly or secretly, the opinions of the Mystics will exert their influence. "The flesh is the beast (says one) which you may belabour." "Let it wallow through the mire (says another); what matters it to the soul which stands aloft pure and sublime, and deigns not to look down?" Then comes the worst refinement of the Quietists—"If the inferior part do not sin, the superior becomes uplifted, which is the greatest of all sins; therefore the flesh must sin to preserve this humility of the soul: as sin produces this humility, it becomes a ladder to ascend to heaven." * Such notions as these, alike destructive of earthly purity and power, can find no place in that system which regards both the body and the soul as alike the workmanship of God, and as alike, therefore, claiming our reverence; and which is framed, moreover, upon the clear declarations of revelation, that, though death will separate them for a period, yet an everlasting union between them shall be effected, the minuter peculiarities of which will depend upon the character of the earthly probation. "Skin for skin (says Job), all that a man hath, will he give for his life:" if, then, the dissolution of these companions is, even in this world where both are so tormented, the grand evil that mars happiness, and which he will sacrifice all

* Michelet's Priests, &c., chap. vii.

to avert, what bliss may not that union be productive of when it shall have been effected under circumstances prohibiting all fear of another separation, and perfectly calculated to aid the full development of their joint resources?

"And now (Mr. Evans concludes), let us return from these considerations to the practical lessons which they give us concerning our treatment of this present body. We have to regard it not only as the present receptacle of immortal soul and spirit, but also as the seed of that which is to stand on the last day before the judgment-seat of Christ, when all men will receive according to that they have done, whether it be good or evil. We must, therefore, in all our conduct in it, maintain a watchful reference forward to its fitness to be in the company of Christ and to his body, to which, if fit, it will be like. And we must regard it with an immediate view as to our being while here mystically members of his body; and we must look back with an awful reference to his suffering body, as having been offered for us: thus, however temporary may be its present state, its relations are spiritual and eternal. Let us, then, look well to its state of preparation for such excellence—let us take heed to its furniture" (p. 57).

We have already said that we cannot coincide with all the theories and ingenious deductions of Mr. Evans's work. He appears to forget that his own lively imagination is very far from being a general gift, though not a little that he has written makes its appeal to no other faculty. Whatever imperfections, however, such a work must necessarily imply, we can promise the student of it both gratification and certain reward. The following are the subjects of some of the chapters, which may well attract attention for their importance:—"On the Sanctification of the Body with reference to Outward Forms—first, those ordained by Christ; secondly, those of apostolical or human institution; and, thirdly, with reference to the limit assignable to its typical inclination;" "On the Visibility of the Church as to its Members and as to its Ministry;" "On our Relation to Superior Creatures;" "On Judgment Present and Future."

That great moral and spiritual advantages *ought* to result from introducing this ample and thoroughly practical theme into our pulpit teachings appears certain. Much judgment, however, would be required in using the materials here supplied. The very word *body* is so suggestive of sin that its frequent use might for some time be almost a stumbling-block. But this is not a valid excuse for evading such a subject, but only a suggestion for prudence in the careful management of words and details.

ART. III.—*Memoires relatifs a l' Histoire de France, pendant le* 18mo. Siecle. 8vo. Paris: 1846. Didot.

IN some histories, as the Roman and the English, it is difficult to fix the precise limits of any particular epoch. The stream of each peculiar movement, whether monarchical, aristocratic, or popular, is heard rumbling in its caverns long before it breaks into light; the elements of all three are constantly present, however subdued their form; and they manifest themselves from time to time, as circumstances arise to develop them, without ever startling the reader by any change which he might not fairly have anticipated. In consequence, the course of events goes on from the commencement to the end just as a philosopher would have it; each event due to some particular cause inherent in the political frame; and each change dependent on principles strongly rooted, and decided in their operations as due to feelings equally strong and decided in the nation itself. By its own natural growth, and little disturbed by foreign influences, the body politic grows into maturity or sinks into decay.

In other nations, as the Greek and the French, the uncertainty of the national character has made the history equally uncertain. Events succeed each other with an Oriental inconsequence: piquant and changeful, their annals amuse the general reader, but they sadly perplex the philosopher. The march of extraneous ideas and circumstances, acting upon national tendencies without fixedness or stability, is constantly interrupting the natural development of causes. A strong line of demarcation is thus drawn between one period and another, as those extraneous circumstances have found the opportunity of pouring into the nation their whole influence—an influence before altogether excluded and then suddenly admitted. In the Greek history, a nation at the height of prosperity in the one page becomes powerless in the next, and the reader has some difficulty in tracing the circumstances which have led to the change, or finding occurrences sufficiently definite to account for it. In France, the life of a single individual usually determines a complete epoch: at his death everything is changed, as fresh ideas let suddenly into the nation urge in a new direction its feelings and prejudices—sometimes raising them to the highest enthusiasm—sometimes depressing them to the most absurd fatuity or the most frivolous folly.

It is thus that, at the death of Louis XIV., the modern epoch commences in France, without any previous signs by which its coming could have been foretold. Until then the age of chivalry was in its glory—latterly in point-lace and velvet, instead of spear and cuirass; but the courtly assemblage of knights and dames was the same as heretofore—idle, brave, and gallant—untainted with plebeian notions or plebeian blood—without any principle but honour or any pursuit but excitement. The same, too, was their homage to their master, given as a tribute rather than as a debt, yet none the less rigorously exacted: they knelt, like gentlemen, with a proud servility, as to the chief of their society rather than to their political sovereign. In all the manners and customs of the old court is seen the spirit of the feudal times, modified in form but not in essence.

Louis XIV. died, and within ten years, beings, of whom the great king would scarcely have acknowledged the existence, began to influence the politics of the country. Theorists, philosophers, men of letters, ventured to ask and even to claim attention in the presence of the paladins of the old court. English ideas, as they were called, crept into society in a nation where society was everything; and a loose and irreverent tone respecting high places pervaded the social world, on which the political world was more dependent than it chose to acknowledge. The popular movement, which had blazed forth without fixed meaning or purpose in the days of the Jacquerie and the Fronde, began to assume a definite form: the long-robed men of the parliament, advocates without birth or fortune, ventured to assume a spirit of opposition to the government on every internal question: altogether a change had come over the spirit of the nation; and yet, how short was the time since the first breath of such a change had rustled in the noble forests through which the old king had disported his pomp and circumstance so magnificently!

Associated with this change from the beginning, and with all the phases of that change to the present moment—the sole thread on which the strange incidents of modern French history can be hung together—is the house of Orleans. The princes of that house are the incarnation of modern political conduct: men not simply without principle, but almost without the affectation of it, following the exigences of the hour with an obedience so willing that they would seem to have no feelings of their own which they could even make a merit of sacrificing; adopting the notions of the hour just as they arose without consideration, and abandoning them as they declined without regret. As

public men, loose, undignified, almost ignoble—in private, acute, affable, fascinating—they have learned the habit of giving to their public conduct that smallness of aim and shrewdness in trifles which would be admissible in a clever country magistrate intent on a road bill, or on marrying his daughter to the heir of the next estate. Too able to be despicable, too unprincipled to be respected, they have been at all times the type of the time-serving politicians of a period without settled notions on any subject, intent only on expedients of the hour. Fond of power —more as increasing their private than their European influence—loving the velvet and jewels of the monarchy rather than the crown or sceptre, they have been satisfied with a useful rather than a respected authority, contented to keep up appearances abroad and to prevent positive misfortune at home. As they have watched the changes of the day, so their fortunes have always depended upon it: they have lived politically from hand to mouth, and their firmest consciousness of power has ever been accompanied with a sense of the possibility of its failure.

These characteristics, by which the whole race has been distinguished, are precisely such as would be transmitted by family tradition from father to son. Meanwhile, the circumstances under which they have been placed in power have been as similar as the family character—at all times with a title doubtful or disputed—opposed to the prejudices of ancient statesmen, and dependent on principles adverse to ancient interests. They have been, in consequence, compelled to rely for assistance on other than the old supports or former alliances of the monarchy. Hence their coquetry with the parliaments, their tampering with popular writers, their appeals to popular feelings and excitements; and the consequence of all this—their tendencies towards the only nation which recognises the influence of either parliament, press, or popular excitement. Yet all these alliances have been managed with a jealousy and bitterness which has prevented the alliances themselves from becoming respectable, or the use to be made of them permanent or complete. To make a clever use of each in turn when powerful, and to take a clever advantage of them when weak—to allow them just to reach that development which the interest of the moment required, and to sap by petty stratagems the benefit which others would derive from them—such has been at all times their policy. Hence has arisen that series of artifices and contrivances which marks throughout the tact and the paltriness of the house of Orleans, forming the leading feature in their conduct with the same invariable result—a partial success at the commencement, and utter failure in the whole at the

last. Excellent managers of single incidents, they have proved themselves but sorry conductors of the entire policy of a great country.

The publication of the "Memoires" of the eighteenth century in France is peculiarly interesting at the present moment, when the results of the ideas then introduced are presenting scenes so strange, and of which it is so difficult to foresee the termination. The "Memoires" themselves—those of Duclos, Marmontel, Besenval, &c.—were sufficiently well known; but their appearance in a popular form ought to give them a circulation among general readers. Written by people of all classes—statesmen, waitingmaids, philosophers, fops—they have all the similarity of the French character, depicting with sparkling vivacity the rouged face of society tricked out in all its finery, yet so rouged and tricked that the languor and hollowness are conspicuous in every feature. It is true of all periods that an accurate idea of the spirit of the age is only to be gathered from a perusal of contemporary histories: it is still more true of the period to which we now refer, of which the ever-varying hues are lost if not caught at once. Memoirs in France take the place of history, because the annals of society are the annals of the nation. We seize the opportunity thus presented us of collecting the most striking traits of a time which has marked the commencement of the modern epoch—a time of which the influence is even yet in its infancy, and of which the continental monarchies have yet to feel the full force, both in their politics and in their habits.

The death of Louis XIV. left the kingdom in a state of disorganization in almost every department of government and society. In the revenue, not to speak of an enormous and increasing deficit—to say nothing of the exemptions claimed by the wealthiest part of the community from payment of taxes almost or altogether—there was in the collection of these taxes a looseness and irregularity more dangerous than even definite exemptions. The collection of a particular tax, claimed by the monarch on his accession, was not finished in the reign of Louis XIV. till within five years of his death. It was a constant practice of the collectors to accept bribes for falsifying the returns of property. Men of influence at court—ecclesiastics more especially—contrived to get a fair rating cut down to one-fourth. The names of more than one dignitary of the Church are associated with contrivances of this kind, which exhibit all the ingenuity of a smuggler in cheating the revenue. In the government itself the claims of the parliament led to endless difficulties. The power possessed by these bodies, while analo-

gous to that of our own parliament in enabling them to clog the wheels of the government, rested on a very different foundation. The original privileges of the French parliaments were simply those of administering the law. By degrees, before they administered a new law, they claimed the right of recognizing it, and finished by denying the force of laws not registered by themselves, even when those laws related to the personal government of the kingdom and were in no way connected with the judicial tribunals. Their refusal of recognition was usually followed by some violent act on the part of the government. The parliament protested—were exiled—and finished by suspending their functions, and, by consequence, the course of justice. Suitors complained, inconvenience after inconvenience arose, and the whole kingdom became irritated. Louis XIV., in his more vigorous days, used to settle these disputes in a very summary way. He assembled the parliament—made his appearance with whip and boots—and registered his own edicts in the faces of the members. But in times when the ruling powers were weakened, and contending parties looked around them for assistance, the parliament added the reality to the claims of power. The consequence of these disputes was an utter uncertainty in legal administration, and the confusion was still further heightened by disputes in the parliament itself. That body consisted of laymen, in the first instance, who held their position by office; and, in the second, of dukes and peers, who held their position by hereditary rank and had but little sympathy with the gown. These quarrels were usually on questions of simple etiquette, but they were not on that account a whit less bitter.

Nor was the religious state of the kingdom more satisfactory. The liberties of the Gallican Church were always talked about; but no one knew exactly in what they consisted, and the ill-defined limit between the power of Government and that of the Pope subjected every edict respecting the Church to contention; while these edicts, turning chiefly on points of doctrine, puzzled the secular authorities, who, nevertheless, would not consent to forego the right of decision because they could not understand its grounds. The Duke of Orleans, after a night of debauchery, assembled round him guards and marshals of France to discuss the merits of a bull issued respecting the operations of divine grace! Thus, these questions became a matter of party; and whether the Papal parties prevailed or its opponents, the Church itself became a scene of the most utter disorganization. This was still further increased by the secular ambition of the ecclesiastics, and the influence derived from the

Roman purple. At the Papal court the influence of Germany and the Italian States was direct and decisive, and the promotions they sought were attained in a manner, if not honest, at least straightforward. But by the French ecclesiastic occupying a secular position, the purple was only to be gained by trigue and artifice—promoting a miserable end by the most flagitious means.

The disorganization of the manners of the day was complete. The most debauched efforts of impure imagination could but rival the actual scenes which occurred at the revelries of the Duke of Orleans. The women of his court were worse than the men in excess of shamelessness. We have no wish to dwell further on stories which we cannot repeat, but which, nevertheless, make up great part of the memoirs before us.

At a distance from the towns, things were much better; but even there the vexatious privileges of the nobility and the government weighed heavily upon the industry of the peasantry:

"I shall never forget (says d'Argenson) the horror of the calamities which were suffered in France when the Queen, Maria Leczinska, arrived in the country. Continual rains had ruined the harvest, and the famine was increased by the vile administration of the Duke of Bourbon. The crops of all kinds were lying about, and not a single moment of dry weather occurred of which the labourer could take advantage. Just then he was summoned from his toil to mend the roads for the queen. The horses for ten leagues round the route were laid under requisition for the occasion. They payed ill for them, and never fed them at all. The poor beasts were kept all night in the open air—they had no food for three days—no wonder that the greater part of them perished."

Such were the exactions to which the peasants were liable in the time of the most terrible famine. It is true that these exactions were confined to particular districts, and that the more remote parts of the country enjoyed a comparative freedom from oppression.

To illustrate more definitely the general views we have laid down, we will cite on each subject, from the works before us, some of the more striking scenes—many of them historical; but which, when collected together, present a more accurate picture of the times than is to be obtained from the histories, where foreign and extraneous matters prevent a clear view of the feelings of so strange a period.

Of the true state of religion in France we gather from the memoirs of the day but little information. The earnest spirit which breathes throughout the writings of many of the divines of the period, and the extreme respect and popularity which

these writings enjoyed, prove sufficiently that all feelings of sincerity and piety were not extinct among the people. But the national history of religion under the regency is a simple tissue of intrigues the most flagitious and meanness the most base. Faction, driven by terror from the palace, had taken refuge in the church. The Jansenists, considered for not very obvious reasons to represent the popular party, were supported by the multitude and the parliament. Louis XIV., partly for this reason and partly from superstitious terror, espoused the Jesuits to the extent of enforcing the Bull Unigenitus—a bull which, professing to be merely levelled at the errors of the Jansenists, distinctly asserted the supremacy of the tiara over the crown, and which treated the most venerated names of the Church with such coolness that the very leaders of the Jesuits themselves, in France, were at first terrified at its tone and opposed its promulgation. The regent, in his parliamentary days, attacked both the bull and the Jesuits. The court of Rome, in return, refused to sanction the nomination of any single bishop, of whatever party, till the whole kingdom had accepted the bull. The regent, entirely careless respecting the principles of the dispute, was irritated and perplexed; but the intrigues of those about him determined him at last to consult his quiet, and to enforce the bull, or the "Constitution," as it was called. The Roman purple conferred so many distinctions, secular and ecclesiastical, that the courtiers sacrificed everything to flatter a court whose smiles were so powerful.

The life of a cardinal about the French court was in those days, indeed, sufficiently agreeable. Nothing of the ecclesiastic appeared in his deportment: he reigned in his diocese without attending to its affairs: the proudest and fairest were at his feet: he gambled, he danced, he sang: the most sumptuous banquets were his ordinary fare: he gave balls and *fêtes* with princely magnificence. The revenues he derived from the Church sufficed for every expense—the consideration he derived from the Church entitled him to every expectation that ambition could suggest. Such were the lives of the cardinals of Bouillon, of Boissy, of Rohan—the first a member of one of the highest families in France—the last a prince of the empire. What wonder if the courtiers of the least scrupulous court in Europe should not be over delicate in their means of attaining such a distinction?

Of the singular characters which the Church of Rome sometimes carries in its bosom, one of the least respectable was the Abbé Dubois. Without birth or fortune—without even the affectation of regularity or decency—he had recommended him-

self to the regent by habits of business, a cool head, great activity; and, above all, a certain similarity of manners and a strong liking increased by habitude. In spite of every remonstrance, the regent employed the abbé in every State affair, external and internal. The abbé was not satisfied: the archbishopric of Cambray fell vacant. The abbé told the regent next morning that he had dreamed he was made Archbishop of Cambray. The regent lost his gravity, and asked the abbé if he thought the place fit for *the greatest scoundrel* in France. The abbé thought it was very well fitted for *him*. The regent continued to laugh—the abbé had expected as much and was very little disconcerted.

Dubois sent over an emissary to George I. The king laughed in his turn—the emissary told him that the regent would laugh, too, but that he would follow the recommendation. The head of the Anglican Church signed the testimonial, and Dubois was nominated. He was only tonsured at the time, and had to receive all the orders at once. People exclaimed at the scandal, but the abbé preserved his composure and cited St. Ambrose. The regent, on the strenuous advice of some of his council, at first promised to abstain from assisting at the consecration. One of his mistresses told him that his refusal to attend would ruin her, as the archbishop would be sure to attribute it to her influence. The prince broke his promise, and attended accordingly at a ceremony which was performed by Massillon himself.

The cardinalate was the next object of ambition to *the greatest scoundrel* in France: he made the enforcement of the bull a merit with the Papal court; and, on the death of Clement XI., obtained a promise from the Cardinal di Conti of the purple, if his influence should place the cardinal in the chair of St. Peter. Dubois performed his part, but Innocent XIII. hesitated: he was, at last, compelled to fulfil his engagement and died, it was said, of remorse.

The means whereby all this was carried—the rewards claimed by the inferior agents—the tone and tenor of the negotiations in general—show the deep degradation of Papal Christianity. Neither is this, though the most conspicuous, a rare example of similar corruption. The elevation of the Abbé Tencin to the purple was, perhaps, the most scandalous instance of the prostitution of the cardinalate. In domestic life the abbé was suspected of incest with his own sister: in public he was more than suspected of the most unprincipled practices. On one occasion he was indicted for simony: the prosecuting advocates held the most convincing proofs of his guilt in their hands, which they

kept back till they heard what the abbé had to say for himself. The abbé, finding the arguments brought against him not very strong, called heaven to witness his innocence, and appealed to the court with all the fervid eloquence of an injured and indignant Churchman. The court seemed well disposed to believe him; whereupon the opposing party produced their proofs—letters in the abbé's own hand, settling the terms of the bargain. The abbé had to sneak away amid the hootings of the crowd. But the abbé was a most accomplished and unscrupulous intriguer: he knew how to render services to those who were able to repay him, and to manage delicate matters for those who would buy his silence; and the convicted perjurer and simonist died Cardinal de Tencin.

Speaking of the successive ecclesiastical governors of France, it was said that France was an invalid of which three doctors in red gowns had successively undertaken the cure: the first had bled her, the second physiced her, the third dieted her. Dubois, it seems, was not worthy to be admitted into the cardinal triumvirate of Richelieu, Mazarin, and Fleury.

The parliament of Paris, of all political bodies that ever existed, stood on a basis the most uncertain and ill-defined; for not only were its privileges as a political body disputed, but it was a matter of doubt if it could claim to be considered a political body at all. Notwithstanding this, as the only assembly in the kingdom exercising fixed and regular functions, its power was indirectly felt at all times, and served as an occasional means of forwarding the views both of the king and the populace; yet, throughout the whole of the parliamentary history, the peculiar aptitude of the French for social rather than political quarrels is exhibited in every stage. For fifty years a single question of etiquette was the grand subject of its debates and dissensions. The heterogeneous composition of the assembly, consisting of princes and peers on the one side—of judges and men of law on the other—would, in other countries, have caused divisions in questions of State: in France, the members contented themselves in disputing prerogatives of dress. It had ever been the custom when the president took the votes for that functionary to address the councillors, first, with his hat on; and it was only when he proceeded to call on the peers for their opinion that he uncovered his head. The lawyers were sadly annoyed at the distinction; and the presidents, lawyers themselves, most of all.

Towards the end of Louis XIV.'s reign, Novion, then first president, set about removing the grievance with a gravity of artifice truly amusing. He began by taking the vote of the first peer with his hat on—then grew bolder; and, as if forget-

ful, kept his hat on till he had got half through the number. The peers, unaware that the most valuable of their privileges was in danger, took no notice, till the president, on one occasion, fairly remained covered while he took the votes of the whole ducal body, and only took his hat off when he came to the princes of the blood. One of the peers protested vehemently on the spot, and the whole body carried their complaints to the king, who was glad of an opportunity to humiliate the dukes, and left the affair undecided. The quarrel continued through the whole of the regency—one out of many trivialities which occupied the first attention of the parliament of Paris.

After the measures consequent on the death of the king had increased their consequence for a time, the parliament set up a new claim of etiquette against the regent himself. On the occasion of a procession at some festival, they declared that, as the first body in the kingdom, they could yield precedence only to the king; and, while they waived their privilege of actually walking before the regent, allowed him simply to take the left side, they themselves walking on the right. The regent, who hated processions and mummeries of all kinds, contented himself by refusing to walk at all; but the claim set up caused in the minds of the government the greatest apprehensions as to its ultimate effects.

More serious quarrels arose soon after; for the views of the old lawyers of Louis XIV. and the views of the regent Duke of Orleans were not likely to be very similar. The unexcitable members of the parliament saw some danger in financial innovations, and had but little sympathy with Church intrigues. The measures of government for the establishment of the Bank —for the recognition of the Bull Unigenitus—lastly, for allowing the Bank to monopolise the whole of the commerce in India—were, one after another, refused registration. Law and Dubois, fatigued with these disputes, proposed to do away with the parliament altogether, by the appointment of judges holding office at pleasure and entirely dependent on the court. The measure was too hardy, and dropped. When the determined opposition of the parliament forced the regent to exile it to Pontaise, he sent them away in the true French style. Expressions of the utmost politeness accompanied the order: the regent sent the members 100,000 francs for their personal expenses. De Mesmes, the first president, got 10,000 crowns, and the use of one of the handsomest country seats in France, which the regent almost compelled the Duc de Bouillon to give up for the time. The parliament amused themselves by feasting in public at the president's house; and, by registering the edict of their

own translation in the most absurd terms they could devise, after having once refused to register it altogether, they were at last starved into submission from the dread of the president lest a country winter should injure his health.

At a later period the clergy began to interfere in the matter. It was sufficiently dangerous when two parties were contending for the limits of an undefined authority, but now there were three. Louis XV., who cared not what was said in the dispute provided he was not obliged to hear it, kept aloof from its settlement from sheer indolence and thus adopted of all others the most insolent mode of denying the parliamentary prerogatives: he would not condescend even to explain himself to them. The parliament rebelled, naturally enough, against this treatment: the king found that they interfered with his quiet, and was at very little pains to disguise his hatred. The consequence was a series of dissensions which, in some form or other, were never altogether intermitted.

In 1730, these quarrels arose to a most violent height, a series of *ordonnances* having taken away from the parliament the right of deliberation altogether. The parliament came to the resolution of making a personal visit to the king, then at Marly: when arrived, they planted themselves in the vestibule of the palace, where the first president begged an audience of his majesty. The Duke de Noailles, scandalized at their position, brought them into the banquet-room, but the king sent an immediate message declining to receive them; and Fleury rushed into the room in great agitation imploring them to return to Paris. Shortly after the king assembled the whole body, enjoined the strictest silence after his speech should be finished, and then gave them to understand that everything they had done was null and void, and that he should treat as a rebel any member who disobeyed his orders. The first president could only reply that "it was forbidden them to express to the king even the excess of their grief." At a subsequent audience, after a discourse of the king, the president was about to speak when the king interrupted him with, "Hold your tongue, sir;" and all that the chiefs of the opposition could do was to lay a written paper at the feet of the king, which was torn to pieces before their faces. The parliament then adopted a singular mode of revenge: they assembled and remained for hours in their places without a single word being spoken. The ministry argued—the president remained silent: the ministry threatened—the president only said that he had too much respect for them to answer. Meanwhile the usual fires of squibs and ballads was kept up on both sides. The ministry actually succeeded in depriving

Pucelles, the leader of the opposition, of his popularity for a time, by a punning song upon his name; while the ministry themselves were sung throughout the streets to every possible strain of ribaldry and abuse—so childish was the mode of warfare by which the destinies of the government of a great nation were decided!

We have already alluded to the vague and unsystematic mode in which the taxes were collected in France and its natural consequence—the gross corruption on the part of the collectors. Every fair proposition during the reign of Louis XIV. had been rejected at once, as interfering with the privileges of the nobility. During the more prosperous part of that reign, the able financiers then employed managed to keep the treasury in decent order; but the consequences of a ruinous war and the universal relaxation which followed, combined with the effects of the enormous personal expenses of the king, threw the finances into such disorder that, at his death, the confusion both of the accounts and the mode of obtaining public money defied all attempts to organize a proper system. Various projects served to procure temporary relief: the plundering collectors were forced to disgorge great part of their wealth to the universal satisfaction of the people; but these expedients served only for the present and the prospects of the future were more hopeless than ever.

In the midst of all this difficulty the two great elements of modern enterprise—the banking system and that of public companies—were first introduced into France. Both of these systems, wherever established heretofore, arose spontaneously out of the financial and commercial conveniences of the respective communities, and had in no case been suggested as an extraneous remedy for their pecuniary difficulties. The banks arose, in the first instance, from the necessity of regulating the exchanges, rendered the more fluctuating from the uncertain value of coin in its own country. From this business to that of issuing the paper representation of coin, the transition was simple and easy. The public companies arose from the inability of private capital, in those days, to compass the new schemes which were offered by the growing facilities of foreign intercourse. Meanwhile, the establishment of colonies in America and settlements in the East assisted the development of the new impulses given to enterprise, and of the new cravings of ambition, avarice, or social wants, which were occasioned by them.

To the progress of all these things the temper and habits of the French people were peculiarly adverse. The limited na-

ture of the commercial transactions required no demand for a more extended circulation than that of the current coin: in fact, at a period much later, it was calculated that the same piece of money passed through fewer hands in France in the course of the year than almost any country in Europe—fewer by *eight times* than in England. Then, as now, much of the coin was buried by the proprietors, who were unwilling to trust their money to a less secure guardian than their mother earth. And while this particular use of the banks was thus uncalled for, that of rendering the standard of coin itself more fixed was daily becoming of lessimportance, as the increasing certainty of mercantile operations put an end to former fluctuation.

But if the establishment of the banking system was in France simply unnecessary, the establishment of companies of commerce and colonization was directly contrary to the habits and disposition of the people. The Frenchman was in his glory when figuring before the multitude: the risks of life and limb were nothing to him while people were looking on; but he had very little notion of encountering difficulties in distant and unpeopled regions where the only witnesses of his prowess would be the eagle and the rattlesnake. Ever open to new impressions, he was but little fitted for enterprises only to be effected by the most entire singleness of purpose: as deficient in passive as he was redundant in active energy, he sunk at once under difficulties and misfortune. Still less did the necessities of the country require any migration of its inhabitants at a time when the country could well have supported five times its population.

Neither of the two systems, therefore, were in France of spontaneous growth; but, when once suggested, there was much to tempt a statesman to listen to them. A governmental issue of bank-notes was an immediate increase of the governmental wealth by just so much value as the credit of the government could maintain constantly in circulation: it was of all plans ever devised for borrowing from the public the easiest, the most ready, and the least expensive. The government, by supplying the wants of the community, poured at once into its coffers a vast proportion of the gold of the kingdom, most of which, while the State maintained its credit, would never be demanded of it again. It was no wonder if the Duke of Orleans, himself a man intensely fond of novelty and excitement, was enchanted with such a scheme, when even the gravest of his councillors, who at first could scarcely be induced by his authority to listen to its provisions, began themselves to discover that so easy a plan of raising money was worth consideration. The advan-

tage to the people at large was beyond their comprehension, but the advantage to the treasury was comprehensible enough. For once, the proposer of the scheme was amongst the first to profit by it. Dukes and peers of France had but little notion of banking matters, and were forced, in spite of themselves, to give up the management of the new arrangements to a man whose experience, national and individual, enabled him to carry them out; and a needy Scotch adventurer found means to domineer over the finance—soon almost over the society—of the proudest country of Europe.

In itself, the establishment by law of a public bank would have been a boon even to France. Anti-commercial and anti-speculating as was the general genius of the people, there was enough, both of commerce and speculation, to make desirable a system of credit which might render monetary transactions more easy, and serve likewise to fix more firmly the value of the metallic currency, still liable to be tampered with. But an establishment which required the most delicate care in its management was subjected to the caprice of men the most careless and incautious in times of peculiar excitement and instability.

The prudence, not of the Duke of Orleans, but of the wisest head that ever existed, would scarcely have sufficed to withstand the temptations of the moment. The banks of the Mississippi and the wide fields of Canada had been represented as teeming with wealth, not only of gold and silver, but of every production which nature has made valuable. The profit from such a source, confined hitherto to the merchant and the adventurer, was thrown open to the whole world. The advantages of private enterprise in public companies, long known in England, were presented to the astonished gaze of the French in the most sudden and the fullest magnificence. The people, who seldom stopped to consider contingencies, and who of all nations were noted for the desire of getting rich at once without the labour of adding pound to pound, set no bounds to their extravagant eagerness to embark in the new schemes. It would have been marvellous, indeed, if the government who reaped the profits of their folly had endeavoured to stop it.

But the profits which the government could obtain for shares were less easy and immediate than those which they obtained for notes. Paper-money, for a while, was actually at a premium above the silver which it represented. The regent scattered it about in all directions without remorse or consideration, and was only stopped occasionally by the absolute impossibility of obtaining from the mills a sufficient supply of the raw paper. Law

complained timidly and quietly: himself a man essentially of system, he had the fullest confidence in his own: his ideas respecting them were sound and beyond his age; and, had he been left to himself, he might have doubled the wealth of the kingdom without danger to its credit. But even he seems to have been carried away by the intoxication of the moment: amidst the flatteries of the greatest and the caresses of the most beautiful—placed within reach of the highest dignities of the State and in possession of the most unbounded influence—he forgot the rising current of the irresistible stream which he was only damming with a board.

One old street, in the centre of old Paris, had long been the chief seat of the trifling monetary transactions for which the capital had occasion hitherto. The street Quincampaix contained about sixty houses, blackened and decayed with age, with narrow passages and battlements that threatened to tumble down at the first opportunity. A crowd of Jews and usurers inhabited the place, who sometimes discounted government bills and paper of value; but their chief operations were the lending money to small tradesmen and people of the market, often merely by the hour, on the security of small wares and baskets of provisions. This villanous locality became the rendezvous of *the system*: the old walls, accustomed to the clink of a few pence, resounded with bargains involving the price of an empire: the crowd became so great that the police were obliged to barricade the entrance: the most miserable rooms let for enormous sums; till at last the speculators, driven fairly out of doors, transacted their business without shelter in the midst of the most violent storms or the most rigorous cold. Knight-errants like their fathers—but in the service of a different mistress—wind and weather became totally indifferent to the pampered nobility of Paris: two hundred thousand livres were paid yearly for a single house.

The road to fortune was open to all the world: the nobleman chaffered beside his lacquey, the lady beside her lover, the debtor beside his creditor, the banker beside the beggar. Even to us the scene of excitement would appear sufficiently striking. What must it have seemed to those accustomed to the regime of the old court, with its starched habits, uncompromising etiquette, detestation of theory, and contempt of commerce? Meanwhile, those who had occasion to examine the system more closely began to perceive its rottenness. The Duke de Noailles, provoked by some slights from Law, collected all the notes he could lay his hands on, and brought away a heap of gold from the

bank. The brothers Paris, the most eminent financiers of the day of the old school, began to collect the notes of the bank to a still more alarming extent, and were only stopped by a forced increase in the value of the coin. Some one sold Law an estate, for which he demanded the price in coin. Law dared not confess his weakness by refusing. Some legal flaw prevented the completion of the purchase, and the vendor paid the money back in notes, which Law was equally afraid to refuse, lest he should bring discredit on his system. To stories such as these were added a multitude of sarcasms and witticisms, of far more influence with the French nation than the soundest arguments.

The passion for paper began to wane: the government early took the alarm: they ordered the commonest necessaries of life to be paid for in paper: they forbad any man from keeping in his possession more than 500 francs in specie. Such decrees were more easy to make than to enforce: people told the commissioners that "their money was at the service of the king, but belonged to no one but themselves;" and the exorbitant fines ordered by the statutes appear in no instance to have been enforced. At last, the panic began with all the fury that might be expected from the temper of a people which had been so readily excited by hope, now irritated to the utmost by disappointment. The crowd rushed in such numbers to exchange their paper that many were trodden to death at the gates of the bank. The government most imprudently reduced the value of the notes, which were to decrease in monthly proportions, losing half their worth by the end of the year. The outcry was terrible: the parliament interposed and the government rescinded its edict; but the mischief had been done already, though the edict only hastened its crisis.

The last hope of Law was in his bank: he obtained for it the monopoly of the Indian commerce—the farm of the tobacco—in fact, every privilege of value of which the government could dispose. For this it engaged to pay off 50,000,000 of notes yearly. The king gave to the bank 100,000,000 shares which had been allotted to him. All this was of little avail against so enormous an evil.

To give some stability to the colonization of the Mississippi—a plan still connected with the bank—all the beggars and men without profession in the lower ranks were collected for the purpose of a compulsory emigration. They were stowed away in barns without food, and so little care taken of their most ordinary necessities that numbers of them perished. This served but little to lessen Law's unpopularity—the regent gave

him a guard, and made him appear at the opera in his own box. This was but a French fashion of making head against the outcry. Law was compelled to fly, and the system was at an end. It had lasted for four years. The individual ruin which it had caused was, perhaps, even a smaller evil than the general derangement of affairs. The prices of provisions and most necessaries had doubled in the interval; the wages of the artizan had increased in proportion; and, when the old order of things returned, it was no easy matter to restore the equilibrium. The general corruption had enabled most public men to profit by private ruin: many a ducal palace was raised upon bank notes and shares in the Mississippi; and one or two alone of the French statesmen came unsullied from the trial.

At one period of the system it was proposed to do away altogether with gold in the public service, and pay every salary with paper—an ingenious mode of reducing the public servants to the most absolute dependence on the government without costing it a farthing.

The most reckless among the gamblers were the nobility themselves. Little accustomed by education to calculate contingencies, the novelty of the scene of excitement, and still more of the possession of large sums of ready money, overcame every feeling of prudence or prejudice. The dignitaries of the Church were not exempt—more than one bishop was amongst the speculators of the Rue Quincampaix. A complete fusion of ranks was the result, and the passion of the time overcame the lessons of ages.

The mercantile madness passed over and left a dreary waste behind it. The new order of things in general extinguished the military passion amongst the higher classes, and no other remained to supply the void. From henceforth, the martial ardour was only lighted up at intervals, under the excitement of circumstance or opportunity: it ceased to be a feeling sufficiently constant to give employment to people who had nothing else to do. Hence the most complete idleness pervaded the upper ranks of society, accompanied by the most wanton extravagance. The young noble rose at midday to a slight breakfast; and then, with the aid of his valet and half-a-dozen assistants, went through the ceremonies of the laborious toilet of the day. Around this toilet assembled a troop of idlers, gazing at their own finery in the magnificent mirrors, and talking over the topics of the time. And what, at such a time, could those topics be, but the scandals of the court—the dissipation of the regent's suppers—the follies of fops and beauties—what else had they to talk about? The time was sauntered away as it best

might till the glorious hour of supper, where ladies of rank mixed with girls of the opera amid gallantries the most unbridled, and jests and tales of utter looseness and indecency helped them to pass the night, till the dawn put to shame the light of a thousand candles.

Still more complete was the disorganization of manners among the women. The prudery of the last years of Louis XIV. gave way to coquetry, and at last to a recklessness of conduct without a parallel in the annals of the sex. The morning business of a lady was to invite conquests, and her evening business to enjoy them; and she did both with a heartiness which on the score of energy and earnestness put to shame the languid insipidity of the men. But the age of man's idleness is ever that of woman's industry.

It is difficult, in going through the annals of the regency, to believe that we have only passed over eight short years, so complete is the change which has taken place in the interval. In manners and religion we have gone through an entire revolution, complete in all its phases. In finance we have passed through a complete history—with a beginning, a climax, a decline, and dissolution. In politics a mighty change has taken place; for although at the close of the regency a strong endeavour was made to re-establish the regal authority in its ancient fulness, still we feel that a new power has grown up under our eyes, of which the greatness is shown in its very submission. Some of its claims were given up, it is true; but such as could have been ever asserted only by madness a few years before. It was like the quarrels of a youth in shaking off the maternal yoke: the mother, for a few words of repentance, believes she has gained her end, and does not perceive that, in establishing some trivial point, she has lost the reality of power.

Under such auspices was the modern system introduced into the continent of Europe. It affords a striking instance of the manner by which the mere change of ideas may affect a nation both in power and reputation. The age of chivalry was exactly suited to the gallant and ardent temperament of the French. Rashness—vehemence—glitter—these were the qualities which such an age required, while it not only neglected but disdained the more homely virtues. Honour, with its strange and peculiar code, stood in the place of honesty, which latter quality, sooth to say, was not one likely to be cultivated by knightly education. The first blow to the age was the change in the art of war from a personal to a general system, and the glories of the French monarchy were dimmed in consequence during great part of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But with the

age of Henry IV. the gallant gentleman took the place of the gallant knight; the personal system, lost in the field, was revived in the court; and the brilliancy of the national character shone forth once more in all its lustre.

At last came in the era of invention, commercial enterprize, quiet and persevering industry. Those who hailed the modern commercial doctrines with such frenzy in France little foresaw its results. They saw not that the new spirit thus introduced into the country was alien to its character; that the fashions and feelings which made its glory were passing away; that the new order of things befitted the genius of other nations better than their own; and that they must cease henceforth to occupy a fixed position as leaders of the world.

The alteration which the commercial innovations of the regency introduced into the general aspect of society was very great. The old territorial system knew but few changes. Families retained their position from generation to generation without even the means of losing it. All at once an element was introduced into society, which enabled the lowest of its members to take the place of the highest, almost as in a moment. The feudal estates changed hands with marvellous rapidity. The fairy tales for which the nation was famous seemed realized by the facility with which simple lacqueys erected palaces which eclipsed in magnificence those of their former masters. Houses and lands, the very essence of stability, were tossed about almost as a species of circulating medium; and in the place of the soldier of fortune, who lived by his sword on the industry of others, but lived at least boldly and bravely, appeared the *chevalier d'industre*, who retained the worst features only of his prototype—sneaked into another's grounds, where the other had galloped—infected all who came near him with the poison of meanness, from which the other was altogether free—and cheated right and left in the dress of a nobleman and with the conduct of a slave. The one was the excrescence of health: the other the ulcer of disease.

The immoralities of the court of the regent excited disgust and astonishment, even at Paris. In the provinces they excited disaffection and revolt. Men have taken up arms for their lives, their liberties, their religion—rarely for their moralities: yet it is to this cause in particular that we must trace the hatred entertained for the once popular regent in Brittany and other parts of the country unconnected with the metropolis. In Brittany the nobles joined with avidity the intrigues set on foot by the party of the Dukes of Maine, at Paris, for removing the Duke of Orleans from power, and giving the regency to the

King of Spain. The intrigues, ill-advised and ill-concocted, failed most utterly: its authors in the capital, who had joined it from pique or self-interest, escaped almost without punishment: the Breton nobles, whose motives were the purest and the most disinterested, perished on the scaffold. History scarcely records another instance where men, in the full enjoyment of property and liberty, have sacrificed their lives to protect their country from the scandals and examples of an indecent court.

The memoirs of the day treat of court affairs so exclusively that it is with some difficulty we gather from scattered hints what was the real state of the country population. Yet we can discern a manly and brave nobility, ready to die for their king in defence of their country, set against him in defence of their privileges—a rude and honest peasantry, who regarded these privileges with the most profound veneration, and were separated by them into a peculiar circle of their own, which preserved them for the time from the taint of Parisian influence. The red robes of the magistracy, which formed the local parliaments, commanded an obedience almost implicit in the provinces; and hence the resistance to the new order things offered by these assemblies was far more effective in its way than that which proceeded from their great compeers of the parliament of Paris.

The annals of the Jansenists prove the existence of a genuine spirit of devotion, both among clergy and people. The organization of the Roman Catholic Church was never more complete, or its duties performed with more zeal and assiduity, than in the remote parts of the French provinces. Instances of almost primitive simplicity in the hierarchy itself were to be found even at a later period. The nurse of the Duke of Burgundy, the son of Louis XV., was accused by one of the bishops of improprieties of conduct; and, when asked for his reason, the good man answered that she had been seen at a Toulouse festival with her neck uncovered!

Such simplicity in a bishop was but too rare in those days. During the regency, the corruption amongst the clergy seems to have infected only the very highest orders: in the subsequent reign it became general, at least amongst the bishops. Few of these quitted the pleasures of Paris to attend to their dioceses, except when compelled by health or necessities. The Bishop of Tarbes one day overturned a lady's carriage by the negligence of his coachman: he gave her a seat in his own and escorted her home. A crowd gathered round him and indulged in a general laugh. It was Gourdan, the most famous procuress of Paris, on whom the Churchman was exercising his gallantry; and every one was loud in praise of the virtue of the Bishop of

Tarbes, because he was unacquainted with her person: no other prelate, they said, would have been so ignorant.

It was not by the indolent and dissolute character of Louis XV.—it was not by a ministry under the control of an aged priest—nor by a court swayed by unprincipled and selfish women, that the growing evils could be arrested or remedied. The introduction into a nation of any system of ideas not of mature growth requires to be managed by a most firm and careful hand. The great revolution of modern times—the translation of power from the upper to the middle classes—began in France while her statesmen were watching the smiles of a mistress, haggling for the price of a place or ruining a rival by an epigram. The engagement of the passing hour, both politically and socially, was the single object of men in power.

The change in men's minds and opinions, especially at a distance from the capital, was caused merely by the loss of respect for things established. Few instances of oppression, or even hardship, to the general body of the people, can be laid to the charge of that careless and unscrupulous reign. The occasional misery of the peasantry arose from the unequal workings of former customs—not from particular acts of the government itself. Here and there an instance of oppression by some collector of the revenue occurs, or the nomination of an unpopular officer through court influence would excite a temporary discontent; but the very outcry made upon these occasions proves their rarity. The maladministration of the government was almost or altogether negative, and mere negligence never excites any serious troubles. It was the relaxation of every hold of respect or regard by which the different orders of society were held together which broke down the ancient order of feelings and ideas. From the palace to the cottage the same humour spread of treating the occurrences of life as one universal jest. No tie so sacred but it was gnawed asunder by the biting tooth of ridicule. A nation of triflers is but a sorry spectacle. The misery produced by recklessness is not long in producing discontent and opprobrium from those who suffered even by their own faults; for when did unrespected master—albeit the mildest and most inoffensive—keep clear from censure? Thus the transition went on: during the regency, trifles became serious: during the ensuing reign, serious things become trifles: from both arose disorganization, discontent, distress, and the revolution.

The petty tyranny exercised at the court of Louis XV. is in itself a sufficient proof of the paltriness of men's feelings. The

cells of the bastile were crowded with prisoners: one, an author of eminence, suspected of having written some trivial satire on a peer—another, a fop who had elbowed a minister at a levee; here, an intrusive man of gallantry who had thwarted a courtier in his intrigues—there, the courtier himself charged with making a joke offensive to one of the royal mistresses. None were imprisoned for serious offences, because none were sufficiently serious to commit them; and one almost laments the absence of some great crime or determined traitor to dissipate the disgust of eternal triviality.

The humbler memoirs of the day often quote instances of amiability of character in those about them, and even of energy and perseverance in the cause of a friend, which would indicate the existence of a better order of feelings amongst the second classes of society: but we find in these rather the ebullitions of momentary impulsions than a fixed habit of duty or benevolence; and the affectation with which stories of the kind are usually related proves that they owe much to their dressing up. Even these grow fewer as we proceed, and everything melts at last into a systematic selfishness: the picture of society is a tame scene of a cold sunny sky, and a broad unvaried garden where every one is rifling his neighbour's flowers. In fact, the corruption of the regency had spread like a gangreen into every class. The vices of the great were at first detested, then derided, at last imitated: men became familiarised with infamy even by scorning it; and thus scenes carried once to outrage from their novelty, and still more because it required a contempt of society to indulge in them, became common in the world of fashion—softened, it is true, in appearance, because tolerated and therefore deprived of the zest of violence; but in reality equally licentious, equally base, equally degrading. The total idleness of the times increased the evil: the war excitement was over—excitement of business there was none: gambling was ruinous, power impossible; a vicious gallantry alone was left as a means of renown and amusement.

The circumstances of society called into existence a multitude of writers, who found ready success in the tastes of the day. Wit and philosophy are things sufficiently easy when allowed full play, with equal freedom on every subject: themes held by previous ages sacred, both from ridicule and reason, present a thousand new objects for both when thrown open at once to an unrestrained license. For ages the French had relieved their minds in the midst of every misery by joking in rhyme; in the pressure of famine they fed themselves with a song; in commercial ruin they put the theorists of the day into

couplets, and jingled them with their own notions. This predilection was often turned to political account, and an obnoxious statesman destroyed in fortune and reputation by six lines sung by fishwomen in the markets. A collection of French epigrams of the eighteenth century would make one of the most amusing volumes in this world.

The ruling taste was taken up by writers of eminence as soon as they could venture to allow their names to be affixed to such productions. The successors of Louis XIV. had not the same means of attaching poets to their court, or aweing them by their power. Thus, the epigrammatic turn became systematised, polished, fashioned into poems, disquisitions, tales; and in this way presented too many temptations to be neglected even by authors of the highest genius. To write was like galloping in the desert without let or hindrance—no wonder if the writing were vivid, various, and exciting.

The philosophy of the day was the natural offspring of licence of thought coupled with sensuality of manners. By none is a reputation more easily achieved than by writers of sensual philosophy. When the mind panders to the body by mixing bright and fanciful dreams with the grossest ideas—when it allows itself to be persuaded that it is labouring when it is only dreaming—when it believes it is not degraded because it etherialises its degradation—to such writers, glowing descriptions and new fancies are offered by the very subject itself; and the reader admires a series of reasonings which he can so easily understand, and which superadds the gratification of his vanity to that of the morbid excitement of his passions.

The following is the account given of the prevalent tone of conversation by an unprejudiced witness—the Marquis d'Argenson:—

"Our current conversation runs in epigrams—in ridiculous stories—in apish tricks of which the only object is to wound our neighbour—in disobliging sallies. Common places, misplaced remarks, indolence in reasoning because no one will listen, unconquerable prejudices, contempt of every thing, unweighed criticism—such is the age. If any one endeavours to sift a question to the bottom or to develop a proposition, he must make up his mind to be interrupted—to be bawled down—to every thing, in fact, which savours of bad company, though this in our days takes place in the best. We have, in fact, scarcely a right to complain; for I have seen the same disturbance—the same Babylonian confusion—in the presence of the king himself: he could not put in a word without being taken up, right or wrong. The Gascons, whom we think so superficial and so ignorant—what are they but exaggerated Frenchmen? To sum the whole, every man has a thousand things to say and nothing to think. The wits of the day are

of such malignity that their only pleasure is in mischief and the confusion of humanity—their only frankness is the disclosure of their malice. The fact is, the more the age becomes ignorant the more it becomes critical. There never was less reading or more discussion of books—there never was less serious study or more promptness to judge men and things. To this state have we arrived in France."

These are the opinions of a man of the world in a book of quiet and unexaggerated memoirs.

Somewhat of this criticism applies, we fear, to our own time and country. With us, too, sarcasm takes the place of reasoning, and authors have too generally lost all soundness of thought and feeling in their anxiety to be pretty and clever. The difficult task of delineating human nature with the firm and manly pencil of truth is omitted for the far easier attempt to draw strange and fanciful portraits, exaggerated specimens of a particular class, or deformed and uncouth specimens of humanity; and this in a style replete with jargon, affectation of metaphor, contorted ideas, and a morbid sentimentality. On the other hand, what passes for wit is usually a smart impertinence, or some old idea tricked out in a grotesque dress, worthy only of a schoolboy's admiration of a scarecrow. Is there not, besides, in our current literature a hastiness of judgment—a redundance of phrases and a lack of depth of thought or study—which might bring down the Frenchman's censure, shorn of some of its severity, on our own heads?

The men who had been to school under the monarchy of Louis XV. were the authors of the first revolution: the men who had been to school under the first revolution were the authors of the second. The education of the first, inert and purposeless, bore more terrible fruits than that of the last, which had at least a purpose, however violently developed. The fiercest impulses are found in the emptiest bosoms. The result of the second revolution was a profound and universal dissatisfaction in the minds of the people. Unable or unwilling to see that the course of ideas among mankind had been contrary to their natural characteristics, they were at a loss to find the precise fault of their own, which had lowered the station they once held in Europe. Hence a series of charges against their king, their statesmen, their clergy, of ruining their consequence in the eyes of foreigners and the consciousness of consequence at home. The loss of the former they owe, in great part, to their continued admiration of qualities which other nations have found troublesome and inconvenient. As we have before observed, the code of honesty has been substituted for that of honour. For a long time men admired the careless and bril-

liant cavalier, who had so brave a bearing while he seduced their wives, robbed them of their property, or deprived them of their good name. The power to do all this presupposed the power of entertainment and fascination, so gratifying to the selfishness of society, which accepts so many pleasures without analyzing their principles: but, as the constitution of society become more complicated, men began to find that they were paying for their entertainment too dearly. The more varied relations of life brought other qualities into play not quite consistent with those once prized so highly, and society found its interests so strongly engaged that it forgot its admirations. But a people who had prided itself so long and so highly on their superiority in the code of gallantry could not so easily rest satisfied with its abolition. They found the cultivation of the new order of virtues much too homely and uninteresting: they felt likewise that, in abdicating the ancient order of things, they abdicated their own superiority. Hence a Frenchman, ever ready to fire at the smallest reproach to his country on the score of honour, cares very little to reproach it himself, before even a foreigner, on the score of honesty. We have known a French virtuoso declare that he would trust any Englishman alone in his cabinet, but not one of his own countrymen. The witnesses examined before the Trade Committees of the House of Commons, while dilating on the singularly pleasant personal manners of the French merchant in transacting his business, have all admitted that it was very necessary to examine his packages. The inspection of the invoice was never sufficient.

Another extraneous change, which has affected the relative consideration of the French nation, is to be found in the growing respect for established laws, which has become more and more decided elsewhere, even in the wildest countries. The same increased complications of society have rendered turbulent law-breakers altogether unbearable. Without carrying the doctrine of race too far, no one can assert that the Celtic population have ever been distinguished by their respect for ordinances. But this is not all. Another of the characteristics of the code of honour was the violation of all law, provided it could be done cleverly and with due *éclat.* Hence in France, from time immemorial, there have existed two sets of antagonists, one exercising their ingenuity in breaking the law and the other in preventing them. The consequence has been, on the one side a series of vexatious and perplexing regulations, enacted as if for the mere purpose of hampering society; and on the other an innate habitude of hating and evading these same regulations, regarded by half the world as personally directed against them-

selves. One of the Paris prints, most hostile to the English, was constrained to admit the love and confidence of their rivals in their laws, and their own detestation and opposition to them. The cause of this, says the *Presse*, is, that in England the spirit of the law is tutelary and beneficent—in France it is oppressive and malevolent.

The loss, too, under the second revolution, of occasions for national display, was, perhaps, on the whole, the great cause of its unpopularity. No nation ever lived so little for itself or was willing to pay so much out of its own pocket for external applause. It is one of the strongest characteristics of the French that, when grumbling under the pressure of internal distress, they are certain to wind up their complaints with some allusion to foreign policy; and, thus, they have the misery and misfortune of taking external politics for the ground of dispute between their internal parties. With us the dissensions of party have been miserable enough; but at least they have been grounded on home measures—they have led to the examination of home grievances—they have made our statesmen acquainted with home wants. We, at least, have our disputes to ourselves: no frightened foreigner is alarmed at their result, or begins to put himself on his guard against the troublesome meddlers who are everlastingly complaining of the mismanagement of their own business, and yet are never contented unless they are settling that of other people. The divisions of party on any question of external matter are sufficiently dangerous; but what can we say when these divisions are based on nothing else. The negligence of internal questions produced by this state of things is yet more lamentable. An Englishman, proprietor of the largest manufacturing establishment in the south of France, once told us that, being summoned before M. Guizot on the subject of some commercial questions, he had to correct on every point the minister's notions of the industrial habits and feelings of the southern population of his own country!

The dissatisfaction of the general population of France was mainly held in check by the immense patronage at the disposal of the governments. From the earliest times of the modern system, this patronage has been turned to the same account: the writers and orators of the reign of Louis XV. are to be found successively at the feet of the royal mistresses asking for places. The number of places in France has been estimated at 250,000. Even under the present unsettled rule, patronage has immense influence in keeping the nation in order. The subsistence of half the educated portion of the community depends more or less on the will of the government; and as the

value of the places range from 10*l.* annually to 800*l.* and upwards, the discontented in each of the higher classes are kept in check from the dread of losing something, either for themselves or their relatives.

It may be possible that the recollection of former terrors—that interest in the maintenance of some degree of regularity throughout the nation—or that the dread of provoking foreign intervention may prevent the French from giving way to the more violent of their present advisers. The future is too cloudy for us to hazard even a guess concerning it. But it will be a hopeless task to give them that spontaneous inclination for quiet which alone can insure prosperity to themselves or free their neighbours from apprehension. As long as it is their chief anxiety to appear conspicuous in the eyes of others—as long as they continue to dress out the body politic in the frills and finery which used once to be the caricature of the individual Frenchman—as long as they talk of their mission to give the rest of the world that liberty and prosperity which they have as yet been unable to secure for themselves, so long will France be thwarted in all her foreign movements by universal distrust and suspicion. At home, she has yet to learn that modern progress is not aided by the promulgation of vague notions and undefined theories, but by the earnest cultivation of tangible and positive improvement. Until she has satisfied herself of this, so far from finding herself foremost in that "spirit of the age" which her theorists are so fond of quoting, she will with difficulty prevent herself from falling behind every nation of Europe in the social, moral, and political order to have established which was not long ago the chief boast of the modern era. Even yet, amidst the present storms, enough, we trust, may be discerned of the real feelings of the European nations to give us some confidence that this boast may not altogether be annulled.

ART. IV.—1. *The Life and Adventures of Oliver Goldsmith. A Biography in Four Books.* By JOHN FORSTER. One Vol. 8vo., 704 pages. 1848.

2. *The Life of Gerald Griffin, Esq.* By his Brother, DANIEL GRIFFIN, M.D. London: 1843.

OLIVER GOLDSMITH first saw the light just one hundred and twenty years ago. When this period is considered, one might almost rank him with ancient authors; but the truth is, he is still of our time. There are yet persons living of our

generation who have looked upon and who remember his plain yet intellectual face; and when we recollect that he himself was contemporaneous with individuals who, in their childhood, had seen another great Oliver in Ireland, Oliver Cromwell, it brings the regicide himself to our minds as a man of yesterday. However this may be, Goldsmith, as we have said, was born one hundred and twenty years ago (1728). Half-a-dozen Greek cities claim the honour of being each the original cradle of Homer: two Irish towns dispute the glory of having produced Goldsmith, Elphin and Pallasmore. Mr. Forster disagrees with Dr. Mitford, and adopts the legend on the commemorative stone in Westminster Abbey, awarding to Pallasmore the credit of having rocked and starved the most unpromising of children who was destined to become the great favourite of men.

Oliver was one of a tolerably large family who looked up to their father, a clergyman, for support, comfort, and instruction. Imperial babes are born in the purple: Goldsmith was born wrapped up in the regrets of those whose slender store he came to decrease. There was an ancient tribe of Thebans, as there is said to be an existing tribe of Mexicans, with whom it was the custom to hail every new birth with tears and groaning. The welcome of poor Oliver was hardly more cheerful: every evil fairy, with Want at their head, attended his coming: each of the tiny people dowered him with an inevitable curse; but a good spirit descended as he lay on his mother's bosom, and the crying child was hushed into smiling, and the heavy heart of that poor mother was solaced, and the world was made glad; for the promise was given that he of the saddened soul should give joy to the souls of others—that the mission of the sufferer should be to alleviate suffering—that ills inflicted should be borne with a manly spirit, and that for his trials during life, he should be awarded renown imperishable and affection undying as long as time itself should endure. Men of heroic mould purchase fame at a fearful price. To few has it cost so much as to Goldsmith; but if his spirit be permitted to revisit the pale glimpses of the moon, and be conscious of the veneration which is paid to his memory, we have no doubt but that a smile of content testifies to the truth that, even on earth, there has been compensation made for earth's trials.

The unwelcome son of the poor clergyman was, like other poor children, dragged up rather than brought up. Dulness and misadventure marked him for their own. Elizabeth Delap tried in vain to teach him to read. To give him the chance of arriving at instruction under severe discipline, he was sent to an

old soldier; but from *him* the stupid boy caught nothing more than a love for telling stories (which has made the world grateful), and an attack of confluent small-pox which rendered Oliver hideous.

If variety of classical instructors could secure good scholarship, Goldsmith ought to have been a phenomenon. Successively at Elphin, at Athlone, and at Edgeworthstown, did he pursue his shy acquaintance with the old men of ancient lore, but to little purpose: his stupidity was irritating. There was no sympathy for one at once so ugly and obtuse. Had he been as fair and unprincipled as the curled son of Climas, people would have pardoned him his lack of sense, and a patron might have placed him in the Treasury. Ugly and honest, he was destined to stand behind a counter; but the good fairy had not forgotten her nursling. At this very turning point of his fate she breathed into him the spirit of poetry: the dull lump of clay was illuminated with intelligence: the cold statue was vivified by the Promethean spark from heaven: he who could not comprehend the poetry of others wrote a stanza of his own. His kindred cried, "A genius;" and, as Irish kinsmen love the genius of which they are by blood a portion, it was unanimously decreed that the genius should proceed to Trinity College, Dublin. Thither it went in the capacity of sizar, and there the friend of Johnson and of Burke was expected to gain knowledge and refinement by sweeping out the court-yard, making beds, waiting at table, and studying, without means or encouragement to study.

This may be called the first step in Oliver Goldsmith's public life, and it was marked by a circumstance which typified every subsequent step made by him in his vexed and painful career: he always failed, or, if he ever succeeded, it was with narrow escape of failure. The first exemplification of this, distinguished his ambitious attempt to achieve this exalted sizarship: only eight candidates could be successful, and Oliver was the last of the eight. In field phrase he was not distanced, and that was the utmost of which *he* could boast or his friends be proud. His college career was influenced, perhaps, by this inglorious success; and Goldsmith was slow in all things but the indulgence of his own dreamy waywardness. The year of his entrance was that eventful year in which the Stuarts had well nigh shaken the house of Brunswick into ruins: it was a year rich in rebellion and executions: the hangman and the ballad-singer profited by both; and the poet not only gave fame to the victim but won it for himself in describing the sacrifice. In this year Shenstone immortalized his "Jemmy Dawson" in a slip-

shod measure which told a narrative, than which the world had never heard a tale—

"So sad, so tender, yet so true."

We are not enabled to say whether Shenstone's example moved the young sizar, or that he wrote from direct inspiration. However this may be, it is clear that the pennyless student, instead of studying Homer's ballads as was his duty, wrote ballads of his own, as much from inclination as necessity: these were sold to the Dublin Catchpole—the Mæcenas of starved rhymers—who printed them in primitive style, and retailed them to the street-singers whose vocation it was to recite them to ambulatory audiences, with "vocal voices most vociferous." The poor author used to steal into the streets by night and listen to the applause awarded by critical hearers to his songs. Would that these could be recovered! Indefatigable Mr. Tegg, who is the greatest purchaser of "remainders" of any bibliopolist in Europe, would immortalize his house, and gratify innumerable firesides, were he to announce to the world an edition of the recovered ballads of Goldsmith, the sizar.

Oliver was a candidate for a scholarship. He failed, of course; but he got an exhibition worth a poor annual thirty shillings, and in attaining this he was seventeenth on a list of nineteen successful candidates! It was all but failure, and his triumph had all the consequences of failure; for it involved him in a college riot—the offspring of a convivial party given by him to celebrate his equivocal victory; and this riot was followed by his running away from college, his endurance of much suffering, and his return in disgrace. He endeavoured to wipe out the latter by going up for his B.A. He just and only just succeeded: he was the lowest on the list, and there was little difference of qualification between him and the next candidate, who had the honour of heading the *οἱ πολλοὶ* of unfortunates.

He left college without regret, and repaired to the parental roof to prepare for admission into the Church. His course of preparation was a strange one. It occupied the period intervening between his twenty-first and his twenty-third year, and it consisted chiefly of making resolves and not keeping them. The remaining portion comprised fishing, rambling, and presiding over a tavern-club, the best merits of whose members consisted in telling old tales and singing miscellaneous songs. In due time, however, Oliver went up to the Bishop of Elphin. The only orders he received was a command to return home and prepare himself more seriously for the office to which he aspired. This was doubtless a disappointment; but what other

course *could* the good bishop have taken with a man who came before him with his awkward bashfulness illustrated in scarlet plush breeches?

He fell now into a long uninterrupted career of mortifications, disgraces, and disasters. He was placed under a private tutor. At the end of eighteen months he was turned out of the house for having accused one of the family of cheating him at cards. Goldsmith was probably right in the charge. He found the world before him where to choose, and he selected the American plantations: he took his passage, but, luckily for us, he was too late for the hour of embarkation, and the vessel sailed without her dilatory passenger. He may have thought of the other Oliver, and, remembering Cromwell, have comforted himself with the reflection that, when fate stood between a man and his intention to cross the Atlantic, it was generally with the view of forcing greatness upon him in his own country. His next resource was the law; but ere he had reached his destined instructor's door he had spent all the money which had been furnished him by the benevolent indulgence of his friends. These, however, were not wearied, and their benevolence maintained him during eighteen months in Edinburgh as a medical student. Here his reputation as a story-teller was at its height, and his waywardness at its culmination: he would sit and spin stories for his fellows, but he refused an invitation to the Duke of Hamilton's, and spurned fortune in a mistaken idea of independence. Goldsmith would have accepted the invitation as a gentleman, but not as a story-teller: the compliment made to his talent to amuse he twisted into an insult. How many have been as foolishly sensitive? For, after all, when Amphitryon has made up a party of very dull people of quality, it is a compliment to be of the selected wits, who are especially invited *for* their wit, to amuse those who have none.

From Edinburgh to Leyden was the usual change of locality for medical students, and Goldsmith accordingly took his passage—to Bordeaux! It was one of his common mistakes, and by another of them he failed to reach the ship in time for the hour of sailing. The last mistake was no misfortune, for the vessel was lost with every soul on board. Our hero reached Leyden, but he was there as one flung ashore from a wreck. His career of study and life is soon told. He endeavoured to find support by teachiug English to the Dutch, without himself knowing a word of the language of those to whom he wished to explain the difficulties of another. It was a touch of his philosophic vagabond. He was steeped in distress, heartily beloved by poor scholars who had nothing better than love to give, and

did not find wealth in his search after it through cards. He left Leyden without a degree; but he took with him one shirt and his flute!

With these advantages he made, on foot, that portion of the grand tour, traces of which are to be met with so eloquently and feelingly described in the "Traveller" and in the immortal "Vicar of Wakefield." It was during this tour that he achieved the cheap honour of M.B.; but it is not clearly ascertained whether he acquired the degree at drowsy Louvain or at learned Padua. We need not describe his journey through Flanders and France, over Switzerland and Germany, into Italy. It is even hardly necessary for us to add that, from the time he left Leyden until he reached the inhospitable threshold of the rude Carinthian boor who is pilloried in the "Traveller," his almost only bread-winner was his flute: a merry tune played by ear, at evening-time before a peasant's door, purchased for him a rude supper and the luxury of dreaming of future greatness upon some charity-strewn straw. With this he was happier and freer than when, during a brief fragment of his journey, he undertook the old office of bear-leader, and attended a youth with 200,000*l.* and a munificent spirit that led him to bestow his patronage only upon sights that could be seen *gratis*. In France, he appears to have contemplated the social and political aspect of things with an eagle and philosophic eye—an eye quick to detect and a mind unerring in foreseeing consequences. He saw the uprooting of monarchy in France as clearly as we who have been witnesses of the catastrophe. In Switzerland, his memories of which are so finely recorded in his "Animated Nature," he came in contact with Voltaire, and Dr. Pangloss talked like Jenkinson, the cosmogonist, to poor Dr. Primrose. We have said that his flute was his bread-winner, but it ceased to be so in Italy. The fellow-countrymen of Palestrina were deaf to "Barbara Allen," pierced, from memory, through the vents of an Irish reed. Goldsmith was ready for the emergency, and therein shewed the heroism which was inseparable from his character. He dropped his flute and assumed philosophy: not as a dignity—he played it as he had done his flute, for bread and a pillow. He knocked at the gate of a college instead of at the door of a cottage, made his bow, gave out his thesis, supported it in a Latin which must have set on edge the teeth of his hearers and, having carried his exhibition to a successful end, was awarded the trifling and customary honorarium, with which he purchased strength for to-morrow: *sic solent pauperes.*

All this was not bad schooling for a man like Goldsmith. It

was hard coin to him in after life, when he could turn his experience into ducats: for the present, however, it brought him nothing except the bare power to maintain a struggle for life. He returned to England in 1756 with reminiscences and empty pockets.

His way up to London was like a dream: we see him indistinctly: there is a glimpse of him acting in a barn: he flits about in uncertain figures, till at last we have him bodily, and behold him pale and hungry, spreading plaisters behind an apothecary's counter in Fish-street-hill. This was a low occupation; and he scarcely held one more dignified when, in faded wrapper, with an old hat dexterously held to cover a wide rent, he descended to Bankside and practised as physician among a wretched class who never dream of paying for medical advice in any coin but promises. We except the miserable patient who patronised his physician, and who, seeing the latter more wretched than himself, procured him employment as reader and corrector of the press to that printing-author Richardson, the father of a family somewhat tightly laced in buckram, but with merits to boot which render them welcome, even in our own days, to the general reader. The engagement did not endure long—not many months—during which he designed a tragedy; and at the end of which he had assumed the tragical character of usher in Dr. Milner's academy, at Peckham. This was in 1757: it was a heavy year to Goldsmith, but it had its compensations. A chance verse, written when he was a child, saved him, perhaps, from being a carpenter: a chance word, winged with wit, and dropped at Milner's table, fell upon the attentive ear of Griffiths, the publisher. This mercenary and cunning knave took Goldsmith aside and penned him into the recess of a window, from which he only issued as leading writer, engaged for a year certain, upon Griffiths' *Whig Monthly Review.* At the age of twenty-nine, he found himself the boarded and bedded slave of a man and his wife who not only gave him his task but corrected it when accomplished! His first essay was a critical paper upon Mallet's "Northern Antiquities"—a book which has just been republished by Bohn, and which would have had all the higher claim upon popular favour had this first essay, written by Goldsmith as an author upon compulsion, been appended to it! In a subsequent number, Goldsmith elicited the warm approbation of the other "Irish adventurer," Burke. This was sunlight on a slavery which had its advantages withal, and whose toil formed fine mental discipline for the young writer. It endured, too, but five months: at the end of this period, Griffiths accused Goldsmith (who was chained to his oar and

who was only in safety as long as he pulled) of being lazy! Goldsmith retorted by averring that the publisher was an impertinent fellow, and that his wife endeavoured to starve him. They parted with ill will on one side, and indignation on the other.

Among the works reviewed by Goldsmith during this engagement with Griffiths was one by the celebrated Jonas Hanway:

"This was the Jonas of whom Dr. Johnson affirmed that he acquired some reputation by travelling abroad, and lost it all by travelling at home: not a witticism, but a sober truth. His book about Persia was excellent—his book about Portsmouth indifferent; but though an eccentric, he was a very benevolent and earnest man. He made the common mistake of thinking himself even more wise than he was good; but he had too much reason to complain, which he was always doing, of a general want of earnestness and seriousness in his age. His larger schemes of benevolence have connected his name with the Marine Society and the Magdalene, both of which he originated; as well as with the Foundling, which he was active in improving; and to his courage and perseverance in smaller fields of usefulness (his determined contention with extravagant vails to servants not the least), the men of Goldsmith's day were indebted for the liberty to use an umbrella. Gay's pleasant poem of 'Trivia' commemorates its earlier use by poor women, by 'tuck'd up sempstresses,' and walking 'maids;' but with even this class it was a winter privilege, and woe to the woman of a better sort, and to the man, whether rich or poor, who dared at any time so to invade the rights of coachmen and chairmen! But Jonas steadily underwent the staring, laughing, jeering, hooting, and bullying; and having punished some insolent knaves who struck him with their whips as well as tongues, he finally established a privilege, which, when the *Journal des Débats* gravely assured its readers that the king of the barricades was to be seen walking the streets of Paris with an umbrella under his arm, had reached its culminating point and played a part in state affairs. Excellent Mr. Hanway, having settled the use of the unbrella, made a less successful move when he would have written down the use of tea."

These are incidental circumstances worth retaining in our memory: to them may be added the following, which is narrated in connection with another work which passed under Goldsmith's critical examination:—

"——in this number there was also a clever notice, from the same hand, of Dobson's translation of the first book of Cardinal de Polignac's Latin poem of 'Anti-Lucretius'—the poem whose ill success stopped Gray in what he playfully called his 'Tommy Lucretius' ('De Principiis Cogitandi'). The cardinal's work I may mention as a large monument of vanity—the talk of the world in those days now forgotten. It was the work of a life; could boast of having been corrected by Boileau and altered by Louis XIV.; and was kept in manu-

script so long, and so often, with inordinate self-complacency, publicly recited from by the author in kind earnest of what the world was to expect, that some listeners with good memories (Le Clerc among them) stole its best passages, and published them for the world's earlier benefit as their own. This drove the poor cardinal to premature delivery, and an instalment of thirteen thousand lines appeared, of which perhaps one line ('Eripuitque Jovi fulmen, Phœboque sagittas'), having since suggested Franklin's epitaph ('Eripuit Cœlo fulmen, sceptrumque tyrannis'), has a chance to live."

The plagiarisms committed upon the poor cardinal remind us of those endured by Beckford. The travels of his youthful prime, which that painful Sybarite published in his declining age, were frequently read aloud by him to a circle of literary friends. When they were given to the world, it was discovered that the poetical thieves of the circle had stolen all the similes: there was not one which the world did not recognize as an old acquaintance! But it is time to return to Goldsmith.

Oliver was again destitute—resigned once more to starve where Butler and Otway had starved before him. For months after he quitted Griffiths, his life was spent in lurking about unclean courts, and in performing small literary jobs for minute pay. In the midst of accumulated miseries his brother Charles startled him with his presence, and with his expressed hopes that he would help him on to fortune. Oliver had himself ceased to apply to his Irish kinsmen for aid in his distress, and his refraining from importunity was rashly construed into his having achieved fortune. He who himself starved was little likely to be able to help a starving brother. The latter passed on his way alone to fight with famine: the struggle dragged him into America and back to England; and, some thirty years since, the dead body of an extremely aged man, found in a miserable room in a low house of Camden Town, told how the struggle had ended, and how death had stepped in and withdrawn the old man from the fearful odds he had to encounter.

The simple and cheap luxuries indulged in by Goldsmith at this period were his memories of early days: he fed upon reminiscences: he was not altogether uncheered by hope, but the future was dimmed by uncertainty; and, of the few bright spots in the past, they were those which lit up the scenes of his youth ere he yet had buckled on his armour to win existence. Of these fate could not rob him, and his letters are eloquent and touching with the memories of those days. Among the weary labours of this period is a work entitled, "Memoirs of a Protestant condemned to the Galleys:" it bore the description and name

of a translation by John Willington, Goldsmith having been ashamed to put his own to it. We may add that no edition of his works can be complete without this memoir, and another—a clever book detailing the life, character, and behaviour of Beau Nash. The latter was published anonymously, but it is still to be found on the book-stalls, and it is not unworthy of a place among the recognised works of the author of the "Vicar of Wakefield."

That the miseries of this time were bitter is proved in the fact that, to escape from them, Goldsmith renewed his engagement at Peckham as an usher: it was because he could procure nothing better—it was a wretchedness just above that he was enduring, and he accepted it. Had he lived in our days he might have found an alternative. Our readers will remember the fatal wreck last year of the *Avenger* steam-frigate. There was a young stoker on board that vessel who, like Goldsmith, had been an usher: he was an excellent mathematician, but misery had pursued till it drove him into the cinder-hole of a steam-ship: he accepted the refuge with pleasure, for with it he gained the hope of advancement which was denied him in his office of usher; he had already gained the favourable notice of his officers—life began to wear an air of cheering promise just as it prematurely closed; but his hopes and the Queen's ship were dashed to pieces on the same reef. The remains of a stout ship and as stout-hearted a man now lie many a fathom deep beneath the tideless waves of the Mediterranean!

Goldsmith submitted with cheerful resignation to endure the renewed and ever-renewing miseries inherent in ushership; but, if his miseries were great, his hopes, like those of a courageous man determined to win in the strife he maintains, were greater. Amid the vexations of his calling he found time to commence his "Enquiry into the State of Polite Learning in Europe." That he had leisure to do this, shows that the long and weary desert was not unmarked by its oasis. At one period, a brilliant object was placed almost within the grasp of the struggler and animated him to exertion. Through the interest of Dr. Milner he was appointed to the duties of medical officer to a Coromandel factory: the salary amounted to a poor 100*l.* per annum, but the private practice connected with it was valued at ten times that sum: the expenses of the outfit reached to 130*l.* These were made in part, and Goldsmith at length stood upon the very threshold of fortune; but he was suddenly and inexplicably thrust back among the breakers of life to be the sport and the victim of fate. The appointment was not ratified; and the secret of the cause of the failure, im-

penetrably locked up in Goldsmith's breast, is buried in the dust of Goldsmith's grave.

The causes of his next failure are better known. It is on record that he failed in obtaining the humble appointment of hospital mate, through want of capacity. He resigned himself, then, for another dreary season to study and squalor; and from his wretched den, for home it was none, he rendered glad the hearts of the readers of the day, while the heart of the writer was shut out from gladness, and the publishers were living upon his brains, as Laplanders upon those of the elk. A portion of his literary labour of this time was given to pay off a debt incurred with Griffiths, who had advanced him money wherewith to purchase clothes in order to appear with decency to be rejected at Surgeon's Hall: they had no better influences on his fortunes than the scarlet plush breeches in which, as a candidate for orders, he ruffled the equanimity of the Bishop of Elphin.

Manful was his endurance through this long passage of despair; and courageously, amid starvation and every evil thing but hopelessnes, did he struggle to assert the dignity of literature and the rights and position of authors. His persevering virtue slowly met its reward, and in 1759 Mr. Forster fixes the period when Goldsmith became an author by choice. He was still as much as ever compelled to write for his daily bread: he picked up no manna without labouring for it with more than the sweat of his brow—the alchymy of his brains. But Percy had crossed his miserable threshold, and Smollett and Langhorne and Johnson were become conscious that there existed within their precincts a not unworthy brother of that craft by which they lived as painfully as the gauntest labourer whose pickaxe dug from the rocks a bread as hard as the material on which it was gained. But if Goldsmith were forced to labour if he pleased to live, he was now enabled to select his employer, and could almost dictate terms instead of humbly subscribe to them. He began to experience the satisfaction of being sought after—inexpressible satisfaction it must have been to him whose destiny it had hitherto been always to petition and generally to be rejected. His absolute gain by this was not great. It was great, however, in one sense: if by it he found himself with no better fare than before, it *secured* that fare to him: he was sure now of the hard crust which previously was a hypothetical good. The public were the real gainers; for, in return for the additional gleam of sunshine thrown on Goldsmith's fate, they received the essays he published in various periodicals, and which now, in their collected form, speak with such grace of utterance

when near a century old. The first daily paper started in England was the *Public Ledger:* it appeared in 1760. Mr. Newbery was the publisher and proprietor, and Goldsmith was engaged to furnish with additional attractions this new venture for the ocean of popular favour. They who remember the *Times* some forty years agone, and think that the *Ledger* bore something of the appearance of the little sheet which has swollen into such unexampled occupation of space in our own days, will have a too dignified conception of the new journal: it was rather like the diminutive evening papers that used to be published in Paris a quarter of a century since. The French journals, like our own, have grown in their dimensions, but for less noble purposes: they were enlarged to admit the *Feuilleton*—that species of literature which has enervated and polluted the general mind of France, corrupted society, and, perhaps, led to the burning of the last throne on that place of sad memories, the square of the bastille. But the invention of the *Feuilleton* is not with our neighbours, but with us. We have not taken it from them and added to it the newspaper, as we improved their invention of the ruffle by adding to it the appendage of a shirt. Newspaper and *Feuilleton* are fairly of honest, healthy, English growth, and our neighbours, while they have failed to equal the first, have corrupted the second. The *Public Ledger* was not only our first daily paper, but it contained the first *Feuilleton*, and this was written by Goldsmith: its title was the *Citizen of the World*, and its uses to society did not cease with its termination; for, on some of its philosophical and wide-seeing suggestions, the statesmen of our own day find inspiration. In 1848 they are compelled to do what, in 1760, Goldsmith recommended in vain to their predecessors.

Increasing opportunities of employment now offered themselves to Goldsmith, whose dignity was made manifest to his own eyes by the piracies of which his writings were made the object by contemporary writers in magazines. He became editor of the *Lady's Magazine* and raised its circulation: he also contributed to the *British*—still existing in name, and

——"he furnished other booksellers with occasional compilations' and prefaces; and he gave some papers (among them a 'Life of Christ,' and 'Lives of the Fathers,' republished with his name, in shilling pamphlets, a few months after his death) to a so-called *Christian Magazine*, undertaken by Newberry, in connection with the macaronic parson Dodd, and conducted by that villanous pretender as an organ of fashionable divinity."*

* There is a tradition existing among the good people of Bloomsbury that Dr. Dodd, when arrested on the charge of forgery, was taken in the vestry of Percy-street

The acquaintance, by sight, with Johnson, and the business intercourse withal, had now ripened into a friendly visiting. The account of the first visit rendered by Johnson is amusing. It is illustrative of the wisdom of the Bolt-court philosopher. Our only marvel is, that one who wished to correct the slothfulness of dress in another did not first try to surmount his own passion for wearing foul linen.

"Percy (Bishop of Dromore) called to take up Johnson at Inner Temple Lane, and found him, to his great astonishment, in a marked condition of cleanliness and neatness, without his rusty brown suit or his soiled shirt, his loose knee-breeches, his unbuckled shoes, or his old, little, shrivelled, unpowdered wig; and not at all likely, as Miss Reynolds tells us his fashion in these days was, to be mistaken for a beggarman. He had been seen in no such respectable garb since he appeared behind Garrick's scenes, on the first of the nine nights of *Irene*, in a scarlet gold-laced waistcoat and rich gold-laced hat. In fact, says Percy, 'he had on a new suit of clothes, a new wig nicely powdered, and everything so dissimilar from his usual habits, that I could not resist the impulse of enquiring the cause of such rigid regard in him to exterior appearances. 'Why, Sir (he answered), I hear that Goldsmith, who is a very great sloven, justifies his disregard of cleanliness and decency by quoting my practice, and I am desirous this night to show him a better example.' The example was not lost."

In connection with this time—the period of his connection with Newberry—a time of hard labour, indeed, but sweetened by those hours of relaxation during which he pourtrayed the fortunes of that well-loved vicar, who will unquestionably keep his living for ever—in connection, we say, with this epoch, we have the following anecdote illustrative of the age and its foibles. The anecdote has immediate reference to the "History of England," written by commission for Newbery:—

"This book, which was not written till the following year, claims a word of description. Such of the labours of 1763 as had yet seen the light were not of a kind to attract much notice. 'When we write anything (said Goldsmith), I think the public make a point of not knowing anything about it.' So, remembering what Pope had said of the lucky lines that had a lord to own them, the present book was issued, doubtless with Newbery's glad concurrence, as 'A History of England, in a series of Letters from a Nobleman to his Son.' It had a great success in that character, passed through many editions, and was afterwards translated into French by the wife of Brissot, with notes by the revolutionary leader himself. The nobleman was supposed to be Lord Chesterfield, so refined was the style. Lord Orrery had also the

Chapel. His capture, however, was effected, we believe, elsewhere. From the pursuit of the law-officers he had long lay hid concealed at Ealing, and he was finally seized in a room on the ground-floor of Goodenough House School, situated near the above village. The house and its vocation still endure—*semper floreant!*

credit of it; but the persuasion at last became general that the author was Lord Lyttleton, and the name of that grave, good lord (placed also, in consequence of its success in this instance, to a catchpenny collection of letters written by the author of Dr. Syntax), is still seen affixed to it on the book stalls."

Whether or not in these catchpenny epistles Mr. Forster alludes to these "Persian Letters," written from Selim in London to Mirza in Ispahan, we cannot say. We only stop to remark how differently these literary (and indeed how differently, too, political) matters are managed in France. In England an author writes a book, and, to give it circulation, puts another man's name to it. In France M. Alexandre Dumas pays other men to write works to which he appends his own name! Again, in political convulsions, when a revolution is to be effected in Paris, the rioters get possession of the houses and the soldiers are kept in the streets. The Duke of Wellington was wiser on the last memorable 10th of April, when not a soldier was to be seen in the streets—the Duke having, soon after daybreak, quietly housed them at every "coign of vantage," whence they could effectually command any amount of rebels that might dare to occupy the streets in opposition to the Queen's authority.

Another evidence of Goldsmith's growing consideration, in the world of literature at least, is given in the fact of his election to the renowned Literary Club, held at the Turk's Head, in Gerrard-street. The Bishop of Asaph declared that he considered "the honour of being elected into the Turk's Head Club as not inferior to that of being the representative of Westminster or Surrey." Mr. Forster has made little or nothing of the fine field he had for graphically describing a *sederunt* of this club, which still exists, though the Turk's Head itself, like its namesake of no mean celebrity in the Strand, has long since fallen into the dust. The best portrait is of a disagreeable man, old Hawkins, the twaddling author of five quarto volumes on the history of music. He was a man who would shirk his share of the reckoning; honest at the bottom, but penurious, mean, and with "a tendency to savageness." "Altogether (says Mr. Forster), his existence was a kind of pompous, parsimonious, insignificant drawl, cleverly ridiculed by one of the wits in an absurd epitaph:—

"'Here lies Sir John Hawkins,
Without his shoes and stauckins.'"

In 1764, the manuscript of the "Vicar of Wakefield" was sold, and the "Traveller" was published.

"'Well, I never more shall think Doctor Goldsmith ugly,' was the--

frank tribute of the sister of Reynolds, after hearing Johnson read the 'Traveller' aloud, from the beginning to the end of it, a few days after it was published.....Miss Reynolds had founded her admiring tribute on what she had herself said at a party at her brother's house some days before. She was asked for her toast after supper, as the custom was; and not answering readily, was required to give the ugliest man she knew. Without further hesitation she named Goldsmith. On which the Mrs. Cholmondeley of that day, with a sudden burst of sympathy, rose up on the other side of the table and reached across to shake hands with her. 'Thus—(exclaimed Johnson who was present, and whose wit at his friend's expense was rewarded with a roar)—thus the ancients, on the commencement of their friendships, used to sacrifice a beast betwixt them!'"

The details of the sale of the MS. of the "Vicar of Wakefield" are tolerably well-known; and, to make assurance doubly sure, they are twice narrated in Mr. Forster's pages. He gives Mrs. Thrale's account, and he adds to it the report of the "more scrupulous and patient writer," Boswell. The duplicate evidence only tends to produce one conviction. Goldsmith, in arrears for the rent of his lodging at Islington, was arrested by his landlady. In his distress he wrote to Johnson, who immediately sent him a guinea; and, as soon as he was dressed, repaired to the then sylvan suburb, at Goldsmith's rooms, in which he found the enraged author, according to Mrs. Thrale, "drinking himself drunk with Madeira, and fretting over a novel which, when finished, was to be his whole fortune." Johnson, speaking in Boswell's "Life," says:—"He was in a violent passion. I perceived that he had already changed my guinea, and had got a bottle of Madeira and a glass before him." Johnson corked the bottle—he was himself, at the moment, a temperance man. The landlady retired—the bailiff sat silent in a corner—the sage read the manuscript, and finally, Johnson, approving the story though with no great warmth of approbation, issued forth with it to Frank Newbery's, and returned with sixty pounds wherewith to render liberty and felicity to the blockaded bard.

We need not point out how little philosophy there was in spending on Madeira what was meant for bread. Goldsmith never appears so little worthy of respect as when this anecdote is told of him. It has, moreover, been so often laughed at by the world, that men, without Goldsmith's strong temptation, have unheedingly plunged into the error, and exaggerated the temporary fault into a permanent vice. Had our hero himself been more thrifty in times when he could, in one sense, command money, he would not so frequently have been in want of a guinea. Had some of his successors, who have wooed the

public ear for popular applause and whose monosyllables coined guineas—had certain of these rather imitated Goldsmith's generally patient endurance than his occasionally impatient outbreaks into inordinate indulgence, they would themselves have both lived and died happier, and the public would not have been called upon to subscribe for the support of their widows and families. It is, unfortunately, with the public as it is with private families: the thrifty are ever called upon, out of their hardly-earned savings, to make good the wasteful extravagance of the thoughtless and the profligate. The latter, ere he yet is in need of immediate help, looks upon a relative whose expenditure is fairly kept within his income, not as honest, but as penurious: the extravagant man looks upon a careful brother as a bank whereon he may draw unlimitedly when his own profligacy has ruined him. So the careful public are appealed to by the friends of dead and pennyless authors to contribute towards keeping the widows of such authors in country-houses and poney-carriages. There are men who have written touching poems on their wives and children sleeping, who have at the same time bequeathed all care of their future condition to the charity of a benevolent public. Within the last half-century the crown and the people have been known to pay the debts of a deceased writer, and to place his beggared widow and wronged children in comparative affluence; yet this writer was a man who might have died as rich as Crœsus, without contracting his comforts or restraining his charity. We know of one whose familiars were wont to speak of his brilliant entertainments, one of the features of which was the placing full bottles of Champagne on his lawn to be bowled down instead of nine-pins!

Hogarth has immortalized the ugliest, most extraordinary, and most unprincipled of artists who ever neglected the future in abusing the present: we refer to Signora Cuzzoni, a lady who despite a stumpy figure, a repulsive obliquity of vision, and a coarse and complexionless face—to say nothing of a tasteless style of dress and silly and fantastical manners—held all England in thraldom exactly one century since by the powerful truth of her acting and by the melting pathos and the inexpressible beauty of her singing. With such talents she might have become a millionaire, but she neglected opportunity, and when her talents failed her she found herself in absolute penury, nothing clinging to her but her vices. One evening, in the year 1749, she was visited by two gentlemen who felt pity at the miserable condition into which the once enchanter and favourite of the public was plunged, and who desired to relieve

it. They found her dull, dirty, morose, and almost speechless. She made excuse for herself, at length, by stating that she was hungry. She had eaten nothing during the whole of the previous day, and now, at six o'clock in the evening of the second day, she confessed that she had not a penny in the world wherewith to purchase a mouthful of food. The friends offered her such hospitality as it was usual to offer in the metropolis a century ago: they proposed that she should go with them to a tavern, where they would treat her with the best roast fowls and port wine that London could produce. "No! (screamed the squalid and famished artist)—I will have neither my dinner nor my place of eating it prescribed to me: I need never want a repast did I choose to submit to such conditions." It would have been well had the friends, on such an answer, withdrawn, and sought out a worthier object whereon to bestow their alms. On the contrary, they apologised, put a guinea into her hand, and urged her to procure food at once and restore the nature that was rapidly sinking. She muttered her thanks, and dismissed her visitors. They had no sooner departed than she summoned a "friendly wretch who inhabited the same theatre of misery," and, putting the guinea into his hand, bade him run with the money to a neighbouring wine-merchant. "He is the only one (said Cuzzoni) who keeps good Tokay by him: it is a guinea a bottle, so bid him give you a loaf into the bargain; he'll not refuse." In about half-an-hour the lad returned with the Tokay. As he appeared, "Where (cried the famished singer)—where is the loaf?"

——"'The wine-merchant would give me no loaf (said the messenger); he drove me from the door, and asked me if I took him for a baker.' 'Blockhead (exclaimed she)—why, I must have bread with my wine you know, and I have not a penny to purchase any. Go and beg me a loaf directly.' The fellow returned once more with one in his hand and a halfpenny, telling her the gentleman threw him three-half-pence and laughed at his impudence. She gave her Mercury the money, broke the bread into a wash-hand-basin that stood near, poured the Tokay over it, and devoured the whole with eagerness. After this, adds the biographer of this wayward woman, some active well-wishers procured her a benefit. She gained, it is said, about three hundred and fifty pounds, and she laid out about two hundred of the money in a *shell-cap*, an extravagant article of finery which was then worn."

We notice this person, whose bones now lie in a pauper's grave at Bologna, not from any regard for her, her pursuits, or her memory; but to enquire whether the distribution of charity is better regulated now than it was century ago. We are afraid not. A century since Henry Goldsmith endured the responsibilities of

a rector's office upon 40*l. a year.* He lived in independence! With as much, *per week*, Francesca Cuzzoni never had wherewith to satisfy extravagance, and died a beggar. Do we order these things better in 1848? The answer is, that, much the same as in 1748, we pay philosophers more scurvily than we do flunkies, and Mr. Horsman has shewn that there are clergymen whose labours are requited with the munificent remuneration of less than a shilling a day—this, too, in a country where a gracefully shameless female dancer receives forty pounds a night for being picturesquely indecent! No doubt, a century ago, as in the present century, individual charity was exercised on sound and Christian principles; but we doubt whether the last century ever produced such a stupid scandal as has been in one case attempted, and in a second achieved, in this. In the attempt, we refer to the endeavour made to raise a statue in honour of a lawyer who, beyond all of his class, was famous or infamous for retaining fees when he left undone the labour for the performance of which the fee was given. In the design accomplished, we allude to the costly memorial voted to a man whose only merit was that, through being lucky, he one morning awoke rich! The names of a dozen or two of pensioners to be found on the civil list would alone suffice to show that charity is still misunderstood and abused among us. When foreign teachers of singing, dancing, and other accomplishments are placed for their lives on a list from which are excluded some of the worthiest sons of England in Church and State, we may be forgiven a murmur. These are rewarded as the Emperor Galba once recompensed a blind minstrel who had discoursed some most eloquent music. He called the poor artist to him, and, taking the alms that the people had thrown into his basket, the emperor put the same into the minstrel's hand, with the remark, "Take that, good man: it is not the people's, but mine." If some of our destitute celebrities are not so insulted, they are, at least, after this fashion recompensed. With what their own talent may acquire for them they are bidden to rest content. If the acquirement fall short of necessity, that which lacks will seldom be furnished by the fund which enables the already over-paid instructor in foreign airs and graces to keep, not only a horse, but a stall for himself in rival opera-houses.

We return willingly to Goldsmith, of whom it must be said that, if he sometimes needed a guinea from others, he was always ready, when he had one, to furnish it to those who were in need. This opportunity not unfrequently occurred after the success of the "Vicar" and the "Traveller" had raised him in the world, without, however, making him wealthy. This success hardly gave him more leisure than he had before; but it gave him

some, and he used it to peep into green fields, take country lodgings, enjoy more thoroughly the literary club of his great friends in Gerrard-street, and, even more thoroughly still, the singing club of his smaller friends at the Globe in Fleet-street. The political affairs of this period are lightly but skilfully touched upon by Mr. Forster: by some they will be considered to form the best portion of his book. Into these matters, however, we do not mean to penetrate further than to show in what degree Goldsmith was connected with them, and how he might have achieved wealth had he submitted to be venal: *ex. gra.* :—

"Parson Scott, Sandwich's chaplain, went about to negotiate for writers; and a great many years afterwards, when he was a rich, old, doctor of divinity, related an anecdote which was to illustrate the folly of men who are ignorant of the world, but which also illustrates the subject of these pages, and that picture of the time, literary and social, of which its politics form a necessary part. He had gone to Goldsmith, among others, to induce him to write in favour of the Administration. 'I found him (he says) in a miserable set of chambers in the Temple. I told him my authority—I told him that I was empowered to pay most liberally for his exertions, and, would you believe it, he was so absurd as to say: "I can earn as much as will supply my wants without writing for any party; the assistance you offer is therefore unnecessary to me." And so I left him in his garret.'"

Is not this, as far as regards Goldsmith, a noble picture? Is it not more worthy of the notice of the Leslies, the Mulreadys, the Friths, who have drawn so often and so well to illustrate Goldsmith and benefit themselves, than any picture suggested by the "Vicar," or painted to their hand in the "Traveller?" The refusal to be bribed came from a man, indeed, who was well aware that governments were not slow to sacrifice the writers who upheld them on their pens, but there was immediate and most liberal pay offered to him and scorned—scorned by a man who had dragged through thirty years of unsettled habits and undetermined pursuits, and who had been almost crushed beneath the pressure of ten years of unremitting drudgery and desolate toil! No stronger temptation could be offered to an ordinary man impatient of his position in the world, desirous of tasting its luxuries, and embarrassed through indulging in a few of those luxuries upon trust. The Greek who spurned the gorgeous bribes flung at his feet by a Persian king could afford to be heroic. Goldsmith could only be so by accomplishing a sacrifice, and that sacrifice he achieved, by preferring modest but honestly-earned pay from the publishers to the "most liberal" acknowledgments and possible advantages from men

who, like Galba, could be magnificent with that public money which they called their own.

With all our partiality for Goldsmith, it is impossible not to observe, and that with sorrow, that his fortunes did not materially improve with his opportunities. He had in him much of the Cuzzoni thoughtlessness: as, in 1767, for instance, when, on venturing upon the uncertain glories of dramatic writing, he realized 500*l.* by his comedy of the "Good Natured Man," and forthwith spent 400*l.* of it in furnishing and decorating a new suite of chambers in the Temple. In these he saw company: and what with his noisy dinners and his noisier suppers, his blind man's buff, his forfeits, and his minuets with Mrs. Seguin, he pretty well drove distracted a rising young lawyer named Blackstone, then engaged on the fourth volume of his "Commentaries." The presence of enlarged means is also discernible in his enlarged fun at the clubs, and his expensive and glittering suits had from the tailor. Let us add, in all justice, that his richer resources may be traced in his wider benevolence. He is now ever making sacrifices for others and ever forgetting himself. His aids are for his friends—the impediments flung in his path are of his own working. Not that his errors were grave: he rather gave away heedlessly than squandered foolishly. He would now consider fifteen lines of the "Deserted Village" as no bad morning's work, and the remainder of the day would be devoted to a "Shoemaker's Holiday"—that is, a walk across the fields to dine at Highbury Barn; another walk to White Conduit House to tea, supper at the club, and a crown spent. On some of these holidays he had with him a character worthy of special notice. If every one went on the principle of honest Peter Barlow there would be less misery and less folly in the world, and fewer subscriptions solicited from the public on behalf of destitute survivors of literary men. The "Shoemaker's holidays (says Mr. Forster) were—

"truly very innocent enjoyment, and shared not alone by Templars and smaller wits, but by humbler good fellows. One Peter Barlow, who acted now and then as amanuensis to Goldsmith—very poor, very proud in his way, who appeared always in one particular dress, who declared himself able to give only a specified small sum for his daily dinner, but who stood firmly on his ability to do this and never permitted any one to do it for him—had made himself a great favourite with Goldsmith by his honest independence and harmless eccentricity, and had generally a place in the 'Shoemaker's Holiday.' If the dinner cost even five shillings each, fifteen pence was still the limit of Peter's responsibility, and the balance was paid by Goldsmith."

The latter now took possession of a small but pleasant re-

treat down the Edgeware-road, "at the bak of Canons," where he worked by fits at his "History of Rome," with love on his "Deserted Village," and with something of carelessness on his "Natural History," the payment for which was anticipated long before the work was finished, which rendered that work itself anything but a labour of love, and which, nevertheless, resulted in a philosophical subject being rendered "as entertaining as a Persian tale." It added to his dignity that he was appointed the first Professor of History to the then newly-constituted Royal Academy—an honour which, bringing with it no pay, was to him, as he himself described it, like giving a pair of ruffles to a man who had no shirt. We find him, too, now occasionally engaged with refined female society; and he who was once in his life on the point of proposing marriage to a young seamstress, is suspected of having entertained something beyond mere feelings of friendship for one of the Miss Hornecks. Perhaps to the conviction that his aspirations were hopeless, if not ridiculous, may be attributed that contracting of dissipated and expensive habits, the debts and the distress, into which he plunged headlong. Even then he was kinder to others than to himself; and, wanting a guinea, gave up to his relations a legacy of 15*l.* that had been bequeathed to him by an Irish uncle. From his embarrassments he was temporarily relieved by the publication of his "Deserted Village"—a poem which ran through five editions in three months; and he could afford to "eat, drink, and wear good clothes," and even to steal away for a month to Paris, in company with the Miss Hornecks, the enjoyments of which trip appear to have been strangely marred by his desire to get back and resume that second nature of his —literary drudgery.

Not unrelieved by brilliant intercourse and warm friendship was that oppressive toil—particularly his intercourse with Johnson, and above all his friendship with Sir Joshua. What glorious dinners were those at Reynolds's, in Leicester-square, where the invited embraced men of every degree, provided they had intellectual merit—where there were ever more guests than seats and less plates than either—where there was a joyous scramble and yet refinement never injured in it—and where the company formed a republic, with Reynolds for a president. However high the rank of the guests invited, Reynolds waited for none. His dinners were served always precisely at five o'clock. "His was not the fashionable ill-breeding (says Mr. Courtenay), which could wait an hour for two or three persons of title, and put the rest of the company out of humour by the invidious distinction."

It is the more unnecessary to dwell further at length upon the career of this wayward man of genius that his closing years present little variety from those which immediately preceded them: they are as the scenes of a drama alternating brief comedy with long and tragic acts wherein death faintly looms through the doubt and darkness. Ill health was added to his other calamities; and, when he had the reputation that might have been to him as a fortune, he had no longer the power and not often, perhaps, the inclination to labour for it. His last triumph was the success of his comedy of "She Stoops to Conquer"—the profits of which went to his creditors and in some degree relieved him from their importunities. Between this and death there is little to relate that has not been said before. If we find many faults we also find many virtues, and among them that precious gift of charity which, exercised by Goldsmith, degenerated almost into a vice; but in the midst of them all—of faults and errors—amid poverty for which he himself is something chargeable, and labours by which he struggled to release himself, or unmanned by disease at their aspect, surrendered himself to despair—amid all this, the inevitable angel descended to deliver that summons which no man may avoid. Goldsmith had scarcely passed his forty-fifth year, but he was not in the vigour of age: he was worn down by a local malady, the consequence of sedentary habits uncorrected by a healthy and prudent course of life. The obstinacy of his character (for gentle as he was he had that pertinacity of intention for which obstinacy is the only fitting designation) killed him in spite of his physicians. He had great faith in the then fashionable medicine—"James's fever powders:" he thought them universally efficacious, as Horace Walpole did, who declared he would take them if the house were on fire. But Goldsmith was warned that in his case they formed a most unfitting remedy, and he ceased from administering them to himself only when it was too late. He lived to see the morning of Monday, April 4, 1774, and died at daybreak. The last words he uttered were in reply to a question from Dr. Turton. "Your pulse (said Dr. Turton) is in greater disorder than it should be from the degree of fever which you have. *Is your mind at ease?*" "*No, it is not,*" was Goldsmith's melancholy answer. He had fought a long and stern fight with life and was in every way vanquished. He had not achieved happiness—often neglected the means to attain it—seldom failed to deserve it, but missed it throughout. As to Goldsmith's religion, we can say little of which we know almost nothing: indeed, we can only judge of it from his works. He was refined in an age not remarkable for delicacy—

independent during a period infamous for servility: he worked for bread, it is true, but under such discouragement he never forgot the true dignity of authorship, and his chief object was to work for the benefit of the human race. The ameliorations that society has experienced are, in a great degree, attributable to the virtuous energy with which Goldsmith attacked the follies, errors, and vices of his day. A man who, under poverty and in spite of poverty, effects this, cannot be called by his fellow-man one unuseful in his generation: he laboured for the well being of society: such labour is in itself of religion. Goldsmith comes under the saving definition of St. Augustine, who says, *Qui laborat, orat.* Grateful memories may play above that unmarked grave in the Temple burial ground which encloses all that was mortal of a man who, working to support life, worked still harder to improve life for others, and who, like Butler, and Otway, and Chatterton, starved for a time in the London streets, and who was not the last of the gifted sons of the muse destined to aspire and doomed to be disappointed.

Among these latter there is none whose career so closely resembles that of Goldsmith, in everything but in its termination, as that of Gerald Griffin. Gerald, like Oliver, was an Irishman: like him he was driven, through family pressure, after a brief season of green fields, gay companions, and desultory teaching, to earn his bitter bread in London by literary drudgery. Like Goldsmith, Griffin indited poems and essays that will live, wrote plays that will never be acted, left a piece (that earnest tragedy of "Gisippus") that will endure, and bequeathed to the world that exquisite story, ill-named "the Collegians," which, different as it is from the "Vicar of Wakefield," resembles it greatly in artlessness, simplicity, and purity. Griffin, like his predecessor whom he loved, while working for after-fame, was compelled to toil and be hungry in dark and dirty localities not far from those where Goldsmith bent himself to the most irksome drudgery and endured periodical starvation. The destiny of the Limerick man, however, was, as we have said, in its end different from that of the hero of Pallasmore. He died earlier, and this was no inconsiderable boon; and, moreover, like the Roman in the Capitol, he had time to adjust his mantle ere he fell, and his last breath was not spent, like that of the tortured Goldsmith, in flinging an imprecation on his doctor and in confessing that his mind was ill at ease, but in calm and dignified repose praising and blessing God.

The whole biography of Gerald Griffin, which was published by his brother in 1843, is as well-worthy of perusal (we do not know that we may not say that it is better worthy of perusal) as

the biography of Oliver Goldsmith by Mr. Forster. In its way, Dr. Griffin's history of his brother gives a more perfect picture of the individual, and a less ostentatious view of his contemporaries, than Mr. Forster's of Oliver Goldsmith. The scenes are most graphic, and we look almost with tearful eyes upon the young and feverish aspirant for that fame which he lived to despise, writing one of the most impassioned of modern tragedies under such disadvantages as he mentions in a letter to his excellent and exemplary mother. "You'd laugh (he says), if you saw how it was got through. I wrote it all in coffee-houses and on little slips of paper, from which I afterwards copied it out." Had Chatterton, to his own enthusiasm, joined Griffin's pious resignation and Christian perseverance, his name would not now have been placed among the suicides. In the possession of these qualities or gifts, Griffin was happier than either the marvellous boy of Bristol or poor Goldsmith; for, though the latter, particularly, neither wanted resignation nor lacked perseverance, it is evident that his trials were not all borne with the quiet dignity which Griffin brought to the endurance of his: and yet there is something of Goldsmith, both in the position described below and in its method of expression. "The fact is (says Griffin, in one of his letters), I am at present almost a complete prisoner: I wait until dusk every evening to creep from my mouse-hole and snatch a little fresh air from the bridge close by. Good heaven!—to think that I am here in the centre of a mountain of wealth, almost 'upon 'Change,' and to have no opportunity of laying an *honest* hand upon a stray draught of it in its flight from one commercial fellow to another, who has no more business with it than I have with —anything that I have too much of already and don't know what to do with—say, common-sense and modesty."

But the whole history of his hours of loneliness and desertion are better and more touchingly told in the following lines:—

"My soul is sick and lone,
No social ties its love entwine;
A heart upon a desert thrown
Beats not in solitude like mine:
For though the pleasant sunlight shine,
It shows no form that I may own,
And closed to me is friendship's shrine,
I am alone! I am alone!

"It is no joy for me
To mark the fond and eager meeting
Of friends whom absence pined, and see
The love-lit eyes speak out their greeting.

For then a stilly voice repeating
What oft hath woke its deepest moan,
Startles my heart, and stays its beating,
I am alone!—I am alone!

"Why hath my soul been given
A zeal to soar at higher things
Than quiet rest—to seek a heaven
And fall with scathed heart and wings.
Have I been blest?—the sea-wave sings
'Tween me and all that was mine own.
I've found the joy ambition brings,
And walk alone!—and walk alone!

"I have a heart!—I'd live
And die for him whose worth I know;
But could not clasp his hand and give
My full heart forth as talkers do.
And they who loved me, the kind few,
Believed me chang'd in heart and tone,
And left me, while it burned as true,
To live alone!—to live alone!

"And such shall be my day
Of life, unfriended, cold, and dead,
My hope shall slowly wear away,
As all my young affections fled.
No kindred hand shall grace my head,
When life's last flickering light is gone;
But I shall find a silent bed,
And die alone!—and die alone!"

We have omitted to notice the date of Gerald Griffin's birth. We will repair the omission by stating that he was born in 1803. We will add to that the record that, in the autumn of 1823, when in his twentieth year, he arrived in the great metropolis, "with a few pounds in one pocket and a brace of tragedies in the other, supposing that the one would set him up before the other was exhausted." Between this period and 1838, he wrote his "Holland Tide," his "Tales of the Munster Festivals," and his "Collegians." On the latter especially his fame as a prose writer of fiction will rest. His other works, produced within the period above-mentioned, are the "Duke of Monmouth," "The Invasion," "Tales of my Neighbourhood," and "Tales of a Jury Room." In none of these did he write up to the reputation which he had achieved by his "Collegians," and that work remains his *chef d'œuvre.* During the years we have just named his toil after daily bread and enduring fame taught him the exact worth of the world and worldly things; and in the year

1838, having raised himself from an abject position at the feet of taskmasters to find these humble petitioners to him on their knees, he withdrew from the world and entered the order of Christian Brothers in September of the year last named. In the month of June of the year following, he entered the South Monastery at Cork; and "before twelve months had elapsed, his remains were laid in the quiet cemetery of this humble brotherhood."

This is not the place to discuss the merits of the faith which "Brother Gerald" professed. He was a sincere member of the Church of his baptism: he remained so to the end; and such a man deserves, at least, the respect of every Christian brother, by whatever name distinguished. We should have entertained far less respect for him, had we found him taking refuge in a comfortable monastery from the personal miseries endured by him at the hands of the world. But it was otherwise: he had acquired not only fame, but the means of enjoying that which he had acquired; and it was when the world most invited him that he turned from its smile to contemplate God. He assumed labour just as he had attained the power of living without it, and the man of high intellect and lofty hopes chained himself down to teach in one undeviating round, as he himself writes, "that o x spells *ox;* that the top of the map is the north and the bottom the south, with various other *branches;* as also that they ought to be good boys and do as they are bid," &c. "In the duties of this humble sphere (says a friendly commentator), he found the peace and happiness which he had sought in vain from the triumph of genius and the praise of learning: the guileless words and grateful looks of his little pupils were dearer to his soul than all the admiration his pen had ever won, and it 'seemed curious even to himself (he writes to a quondam literary friend), that he felt a great deal happier in the practice of this daily routine than he ever did while he was roving about the great city, absorbed in the modest project of rivalling Shakespeare, and throwing Scott into the shade!'"

The old volumes published by Florentine Delaulne more than a century and a quarter ago, professing to give "Relations de la Vie et de Mort de quelques Religieux de l'Abbaye de la Trappe," present no such picture as the above. They merely show to our wondering gaze the spectacle of assassins and libertines running from the pursuit of outraged laws and gaining an asylum among other outcasts of society. These volumes, by the way, commence their arguments upon the excellence of living solitary by a curious assertion and as a curious a misprint. The first line in the preface says, "Nous sommes *nez* pour la societé;"

we might very aptly answer the assertion and imitate the error, by saying "We *nose* it!"

Butler, Otway, Chatterton, and Griffin!—these are bright names on the roll of Britain's literary history; but by what sufferings and sacrifices did they purchase fame! Butler, who poured out in careless profusion his bullion of wit, regardless of the stamp,* was the only one of the four who reached the confines of old age. The sturdy son of the Worcestershire farmer, after he had astounded his contemporaries with "Hudibras," lived known but to a few, and upon their charity. By the same charity he was buried in St. Paul's, Covent Garden, A.D. 1680, when he had accomplished his 68th year. Otway is declared by common fame to have been choked by a morsel of roll which he was too eagerly eating, after having long suffered from extreme hunger. His piteous condition is not doubted; but there is another story extant as to the immediate cause of his death. The author of "Venice Preserved" is said by some to have fallen a victim to the warmth of his friendship. His friend Blakiston was murdered in the street: the murderer fled to France, and Otway pursued him on foot as far as Dover. He returned to London worn out with fever and fatigue, and died five years after Butler, of the consequence of drinking a draught of cold water, when overheated. Whichever of these stories may be true, one thing is certain, that at the early age of thirty-four he died in extreme penury at a low public house on Tower-hill, known by the sign of the "Bull." Some years later, Chatterton expired under his own hand, impelled by destitution, in an obscure house in a dirty Holborn-lane. Still nearer to our own time, Goldsmith died distressed like Butler, and was buried, like him, at the charge of his friends; and, finally, Griffin, who had starved like his predecessors, "ut solent poetæ," more fortunate than they, found before his death that peace of mind which best befits humanity to meet its great adversary. A mournful volume might be written of the trials of literary men; but we must be satisfied with pointing to the four we have above-named. Their story contains ample proof that the rewards of literature are not worth the sacrifices made to attain them, and that the world of readers have no reason to envy the brightest intellect among the world of authors.

---

* "The spangles of wit which Prior could afford, he knew how to polish; but he wanted the bullion of Butler. Butler pours out a negligent profusion, certain of the weight, but careless of the stamp."—*Johnson.*

ART. V.—*Apollyon and the Reaction of the Slavonians; with a Review of the Political State of Europe under the Action of the Contending Principles.* By Colonel F. T. BULLER, H.P., Author of "Thoughts on the Spirit of the Movement." London: Partridge and Oakey. 1847.

THE moral world, like the earth, has its seasons, its seed time, and its harvestings—its periods of repose and of teeming produce. It is given to one to sow and another to reap; and this is true of generations as of individuals. Men who stand distinguished from their fellows, by their painful toils of mental labour or their hardy speculations, scatter principles of good or evil broad cast upon the surface of society and leave the fruits to be gathered by others. Where they are for good, many reap them with little thought of the patience and suffering in which the seed has been sown: where they are for evil, those who are most affected by the result too often slumber whilst they are germinating, and then, too late, wake up affrighted in some period of social strife to behold a prurient fruition of calamity and to assist unwillingly in its harvesting. "*Too late!*" What a significance is there in these little words! They contain the history of fallen dynasties, the wreck of great resolves, the abortion of noble plans, the death of freedom, the agony of frustrated ambition disappointed of its prize at the very moment when it was nearly reached. Read the history of banished kings: what is it but a repetition of the same thing? The privilege of prerogative forced one step too far—just demands conceded one moment too late. Great conspiracies have failed from the miscalculation of an hour's time; nations have been thwarted in their struggle for freedom by a short procrastination in striking the decisive blow; and many a lofty scheme of social regeneration or benevolence has missed its aim by the passing over the exact period when the one would have availed and the other have been appreciated.

Another signal lesson has been added to the many which the world's history contains. The King of the French, who stepped to the throne upon the ruined fortunes of a house to which he owed attachment by blood and allegiance as a subject, has in the hour of trial followed the example of his predecessor and experienced a similar fate. Elevated to authority upon principles of pure democracy, accepting it with the promise of giving to those principles their fullest development, he soon betrayed the trust reposed in him and broke the pledges which he had given. In doing this, he

neither understood the moral force of the power which had carried him to the throne nor the inevitable working and ultimate tendency of the spirit with which he was allied. Superior in talent to Charles X., he relied on his own resources for the establishment of a despotism, which could only be accomplished by the destruction of the theories to which he had yielded a solemn adhesion. He was not ignorant of the struggle which awaited him in the attempt: with a Bourbon's infatuation, he trusted to the *prestige* of royalty to bear him through it scatheless, though he had himself weakened and dishonoured the *prestige* on which he relied; and, with a Bourbon's obstinacy, he refused to consider the demonstrations which were daily accumulating to the fact that, however he might be able to prolong the struggle, he must finally succumb. The only thing that could have saved him was timely concession: it was the most important part of the lesson which the three days of July should have taught him. His recollection and his sagacity failed him at the very moment when he most needed them; and there is a curious and melancholy coincidence both in the confidence with which these hapless monarchs braved the conflict and the manner in which they yielded when it was too late. There were circumstances in the policy of Charles X. to excuse it, and great want of foresight and preparation to account for its failure. Yet he stood consistently throughout by a principle and fell in its maintenance. He had never been other than a monarch inheriting power by legitimate right; and his firm conviction in the righteousness of his claim blinded him to the nature and amount of the moral force arrayed against him. Hence, being ignorant of, or refusing to believe in, the strength of the democratic element in his kingdom, his preparations were by no means adequate to the occasion. With Louis Philippe the case, however, was different. He was well acquainted with the difficulties of his position; and, as far as physical force could go, fully prepared to meet them. It seems, therefore, something like a retributive judgment that, with all the advantages of his predecessor's example before his eyes, a knowledge of the causes that led to his failure, and a consequent provision against a like calamity, he should yet, at the last, have pursued a similar course and met with a similar fate. Charles X. could not see that the struggle was, in his case, against legitimate monarchy, and therefore he considered that he sufficiently met the exigency of the crisis by abdicating in favour of Henri of Bordeaux. Louis Philippe fancied that his dynasty was founded on a

principle which, though he had himself outraged it, would be fully satisfied by his own withdrawal and the substitution of his grandson in his place. The proposition was met in the tumultuous assembly that had taken possession of the Chamber of Deputies by the solitary cry, "*Il est trop tard;*" and that one cry not only sealed the fate of monarchy in France, but was the expression of a force that has since shaken all Christendom to its centre. It was a memorable sentence: kings have learnt their weakness and subjects their power in considering it.

The revolution which has recently occurred has this peculiar significance, that it is a first instalment, so to speak, of the true and ultimate development of the democratic element. The movement against Charles X. was made by the *bourgeoisie*. The workpeople were irritated to take their part in it by an elaborate enumeration of wrongs which, as far as they were concerned, had only an illusory existence, and encouraged by promises which were never meant to be realised; but though it was by their courage, and with their blood, that the revolution of 1830 was effected, it was promoted and directed by the *bourgeoisie* to answer their own ends. They selfishly desired for their wealth that aristocracy which had only attached to blood; they coveted for themselves its advantages and powers, and the revolution was their means of attaining them. The throne was to be established on their prerogative—the dynasty was to be the expression of their power—the court the representative of their privilege. Charles X. was the King *of France*—the descendant of a long line of chivalry and nobility—the inheritor and champion of the spirit and immunities of high estate—the first gentleman of his kingdom. Louis Philippe, on the contrary, was the King of THE FRENCH (a significant distinction)—a *bourgeois* monarch, pledged to maintain the claims of wealth, who commenced his reign by walking about the streets of Paris with a cotton umbrella in true tradesman's guise, to show the people how he understood the condition of his elevation; and who ended it by trampling on the class which had raised him, to show them how he despised it when it had served his purpose. After all, there was something more of nobility in the fate of him who fell in a consistent struggle to uphold the privilege of his rank than in the ignominious defeat of one who entertained the vain idea of building a monarch's dignity on the base elements to which he was indebted for a monarch's name.

But the *bourgeoisie* were, in their turn, to find that the

limit which they had placed to the manifestation of the democratic element, as most expressive of their own wants and most consistent with the safety of the kingdom, was by no means the true or the final limit. In aiding them, the working classes had learned their strength, and they now added their powerful voice in settling the point as to what should constitute the boundary of revolutionary movements. With much more intelligence than their masters they entered into the struggle of February; and, in using the *bourgeoisie* for their own purposes, paid them back in their own coin for the wrong which had been inflicted on them in 1830. Thus, the recent revolution is significant of the fact that a further step in the progress of democracy has been attained, from which it is impossible to recede: as the aristocracy was made to yield to the *bourgeoisie*, so these, in their turn, have found a more terrible master in the domination of the *ouvriers*.

The accounts which are given of the three days of February inform us that, on the second day, about five or six hundred of the National Guards assembled in the Rue Lepelletier. As this was their first appearance in the struggle, the people looked on with anxiety, uncertain as to the part which they were about to take. At length one of their number stepped forward and said—"We are not all agreed as to the *nature* or the *measure* of the reform which you demand; but we are agreed as to its necessity and determined to enforce it." We mention this incident because it was indicative of two things—the mistaken notion that they had the command of the movement in their hands, and the ignorance which they displayed of the true position of things in assigning, as an ultimate limit, a point which was soon distanced. The king, whose power they had created, was to receive a lesson and to be reminded of the true basis of his authority—this is all they seem to have contemplated. This time, however, the people rose with a very different understanding of their own position from that which they had possessed in 1830. They had been deceived alike by the *bourgeoisie* and their monarch; they had it already in their hearts to be avenged on both; nevertheless, they kept their counsel; used the aid of the National Guard till it was too fully compromised to recede; and then, to its astonishment, compelled it to grace a triumph which it regarded with distaste, and to help in attaining an object which it had never anticipated.

If a struggle between a king and his people were not so full of melancholy and fearful elements, we might be tempted to smile at the lesson which these turbulent shopkeepers received,

and the manner in which it was taught. It is difficult to say which was the greater—their presumption in assuming that the movement was to be measured at their will, or the mortification that they must have felt at the part which they were ultimately made to play. We confess that we have little sympathy with this class. As things stand, it is much to be desired that the 200,000 bayonets which the National Guard are said to muster, in the awakened condition of their danger, will avail to check the rampant monster which they themselves have fostered into being, for the peace of Europe rests upon the issue. But, as far as the class is concerned, we have no respect for its selfishness and no pity for its defeat. The working man, fighting for a principle without a care for the blood or the suffering which it will cost him in its attainment, is, with all his extravagances of thought and action, a far nobler being than the comfortable and egotistical National Guard, who only fights for the preservation of order when his own goods are in peril, and who, when it suits his purpose, levels his musket without compunction at the man with whom he has fraternised in insubordination.

In every great political crisis there is always some one circumstance which is supposed to be its cause—which stamps a character on it and gives it a name. It will be found, however, that the real causes of all revolutionary movements are more remote—have been long in operation; and that the peculiar and characteristic circumstance of the moment rather furnishes the fitting opportunity than the original motive. The famous ordonnances of July, like the hindrance of the banquet in February, yielded occasion for the explosion of the elements which had been long in process of combustion; but the elements owed their origin to the existence of principles of which these acts were but isolated expressions. Under the empire, the *bourgeoisie* had been taught to understand their power, but had not been elevated to the position which they coveted. The restoration was, as they fancied, one step towards its attainment; but, with the return of the Bourbon, came a host of titled idlers, who had recollected nothing in their exile but their misfortunes, and learned nothing from their misfortunes but the desire of retaliation. The aristocracy of wealth was again at a discount: as a natural consequence, it struggled for the ascendancy; and, maturing in strength of purpose with the progress of events, it finally found a fitting opportunity in the ordonnances of July for the assertion of its power.

But if, in the creation of a citizen king with a banker for

prime minister, they complacently beheld the work of their hands and the elevation of their order, these results were by no means satisfactory to another class who had helped to attain them. With a very different interpretation of the word "people," and a very different understanding of their rights, these beheld in the monarchy of Louis Philippe but another form of the despotism against which they had protested. They soon felt that the barricade must be again erected, but with another object in view. With indefatigable energy they, therefore, seized upon every opportunity which the events of the last fifteen years have presented; and, though often foiled and defeated, at last found *the one* fitted to their purpose. The names which figure most in the recent doings, and at the present moment in Paris, are the very names which meet the eye in reading the relation of every republican insurrection or *emeute* during this period. He who is an anarchist whilst in subjection becomes a maintainer of order when he is in authority; and so we cannot wonder that the men who are now eloquently wise in the advocacy of moderation and subordination are the self same men who have violently broken through the bounds of both when endeavouring to attain their object.

But the grave question which remains to be settled is—have they found the true *terminus* of the movement which they love to designate as the movement of the people? Can they rule and coerce the spirit which they have evoked? They have given to the democratic element an enlarged development—have they given to it its final one? They have passed by the plotters of 1830 in their notions of popular rights and privileges—will they not in their turn be successfully distanced by others? This is what the world waits to see.

The events of the revolution in France have told fearfully over the greater part of the civilised world; and we have thus at length alluded to it, because, in its general results, it proves the rising power and terrible importance of a class long held in subjection—we mean the people; and because one of the characteristic facts of the day is highly illustrative of the subject matter so ably treated by the author of the work before us—we mean the tendency of distinct races, notwithstanding the so-called Catholic cry of equality and fraternity, to stand out in isolation from each other.

Almost all the capitals of Christendom have witnessed imitations of the Parisian movement: the measure of success attained by the democratic party has greatly varied; but one

of two results is everywhere manifest. Success has contributed to the consolidation of a mighty and irresponsible power: failure has furnished fresh elements of exasperation and energised the hope of revenge. Madrid has been coerced by the rude hand of a soldier, and Naples has suffered a massacre of its inhabitants at the command of its monarch. With these two exceptions, the victory has been on the side of the people wherever such movements have taken place;* but the social condition of Spain is a paradox in the history of nations, and it is more than probable that, ere these pages are in print, the Neapolitans will have exacted a terrible and sanguinary compensation for their defeat. Be this as it may, we have commenced a new and a solemn social era. "The people" are now words which denominate a formidable class, possessed of an universal creed, Catholic, so to speak, in its articles of evil import, and holding as a cardinal point of faith the doctrine that, as power is alone of popular creation, so resistance to it at pleasure is a matter of popular privilege.

Many assert that the important aspect usurped by this class is but a political phenomenon of ephemeral existence; that after a time, out of the present convulsed condition of society, a better state of things will arise; that order will resume its reign under purified forms; and that the people will naturally and easily fall back into the place of subordination which properly belongs to them. We confess that we are not of this opinion: that which we are called to witness is another step towards the final result of a great tendency of centuries. There is a cycle in the manifestation of tyrannies as in other things. The world has suffered under the despotism of monarchical power; has been harrassed by the oppressions of aristocratic prerogative; has groaned under the tyrannies of the mastership of wealth; but one thing is needed to complete this cycle—that is, the tyranny of irresponsible power, and it is now the turn of the people. It is the condition of our common humanity to know when we suffer: it is its natural instinct to resist the infliction of suffering: it is also as natural an abuse of the possession of power to inflict it. To suppose that the people, as a class, will form an exception to this rule, is to suppose that, whilst they are subject to the conditions of a common humanity, they are exempt from its infirmity: and this is to suppose a fact which the experience of nearly six thousand years has pronounced to be impossible. Whenever the advent of the

* We do not include England in this remark, for the obvious reason that the Chartist riot in London was not worthy the name of "a movement."

people to power is near, the time of popular tyranny is not far distant. This, if we read the Scriptures aright, is the last form in which the tyranny of man over man will be manifest; and, if the facts of history are worth anything, it will be the most fearful.

The struggle of the people for centuries has been for a progressive recognition of their existence and rights as a distinct class. They first fought for personal liberty, when they were emancipated from the thraldom of serfage; they then struggled for social and political privileges—these were won; and they are now at war with the classes above them for political consequence and power. Amongst the lower classes of the east there is yet personal bondage as well as social slavery; but the spirit of the west is travelling thitherwards, and it will not be long before they, too, gain the point which their more civilised brethren in Europe have already attained. Throughout the conflict of the people with their rulers the religious element has been prominent. They have contended for temporal advantages, whilst firmly believing that they have only asserted a claim to religious freedom. This faith has given the dignity of martyrdom to their sufferings in failure, and allied the terrible bigotry of fanaticism to their success. We have a proof of this in the endurance of the "*Cathares*," the "Poor Men of Lyons," the "Waldenses," in the desolating triumphs of the Bohemian followers of Ziska, and in the risings of the *Jacquerie*. The people have still a faith—a religion—no longer, alas! a pure and unmixed Christianity; but a creed composed of its rationalised forms, in which the popular will is recognized as the divinity, and its elevation to the throne of absolute authority is accounted as a sacred duty. There is sufficient power in this popular faith to give force to fanaticism, but no one principle on which to build a restraint upon evil.

It would seem, too, that, for the better development of the popular element and the readier assertion of its power, the distinctive races of men were withdrawing from each other to maintain the struggle within the more limited compass of their own homes, and in more direct antagonism to the rulers of their own blood. Thus, the yoke of the foreigner is everywhere broken as a preliminary to domestic strife; but the battle-cry and the standard of national liberty, raised against the domination of the alien, will have a further use and significance when prince and people born on the same soil have leisure to face each other. Magyar and Slaav, Italian and Teuton, are breaking the bonds which held them together

and separating—but why? The Magyar, that he may obtain the independence of his country; the Slaav, that he may reconstitute an empire for his race; the Italian, that he may drive the Austrian from the land; the Teuton, that he may realise the Utopia of one fatherland, purged from the impurities of corruption, and a sacred confederation where selfishness shall find no place. When these several objects are, either in reality or in seeming, accomplished, what will be the result? The Hungarian prince will have to reckon with his vassal and the Sclavonic nobleman with his serf. The Italian will carry to its fullest extent the democratic lessons which the Pope has been teaching to his cost at Rome; whilst the German will play with his new toy of political privilege till he breaks it; but, in breaking it, he will learn its power and reconstruct it in the form of a deadly instrument of mischief.

The work before us was published in the course of last year; and we learn from the preface that it was written, four years before the period of its publication, "in the countries of whose history and policy it professes to treat." It is unquestionably a very clever work, full of able expositions and sagacious predictions—as much a work of political prophecy as of historical reflections. We have had it in our hands for some time, for the subject matter of it cannot be hastily mastered; but we do not regret the delay in bringing it before our readers, as the recent events which have startled the world, and are still with cumulative force convulsing the very foundations of society, enable us to test its value and verify many of its predictions.

The leading idea of this work may be gathered from the following passage, extracted from the "Portfolio" of 1836, which passage the colonel has adopted as a motto to his preface:—

"The subjugation of Poland has changed the character, and, if suffered to proceed, will soon change the name of Russia. From 'Muscovy' she rose to 'all the Russias;' and from 'all the Russias' she will extend to 'Slavonia.'"

Consistently with this idea, the object of Colonel Buller is to show that the present reactionary movement which is taking place amongst all the Sclavonic tribes—and there can be no doubt that such a movement is progressing, though its several steps may, for the moment, be hidden in the confused melée of social and political strife which the greater part of Europe is at the present hour engaged—is towards the consti-

tution of one great empire, of which Russia shall become a constituent part and the czar the emperor.

The colonel gives a rapid sketch of the rise of the Sclavonian race, preparatory to a more elaborate *precis* of their history (which portion of the work we recommend to the attention of our readers as full of condensed information), and thus proceeds:—

"From the shores of the Baltic to the banks of the Cattaro—from the deserts of Central Asia to the confines of civilized Europe—impatiently awaiting the nod of despotism, this energetic barbarian race stand in threatening attitude, and brook, with ill-disguised reluctance, the efforts to control, and calculate their reaction on trembling and enervated civilisation. The fiat of the great leader on whom their regards are fixed is their law, and that law they defy Europe to disobey. Whether the czar, in full confidence of the strength of their devotion, dethrones or elevates a monarch, his diplomacy backed by their ardour challenges resistance; until, with the most perfect contempt at the pusillanimity of the west, he shall think the moment of action propitious to proclaim himself Sovereign of the east and west and arbiter of the world.

"Oppressors and oppressed—the founders and destroyers of empires—despots and slaves—these people have undergone all the changes and revolutions of society; but they still retain an originality of character, with features too deeply marked, to be entirely destroyed by the sweeping hand of time. As obscure in their origin, and as insignificant in their apparent relative position to the rest of the civilized world as the ferocious Moguls, and subsequently the terrific Turkomans and those hordes of Central Asia who, at a later period of history, sprung up into sudden and desolating action and gave a name to one of the greatest changes in religion and morality—like those nations whose existence was scarce felt until, as a shock of thunder and with the scathing rapidity of lightning, they announced themselves to a careless and sleeping world by the horrors of conquest and desolation—as such, and as little heeded, are the nations whose reaction is now in silent but actual and sure progress; and as irresistible will be the development of their power when once their energies, now dormant, are roused into a course of action. And while old Europe is sleeping over its past glories—while corruption is undermining the foundations and resources of States—those people of primitive habits—of obedience and devotion to a cherished cause—will burst out as the irresistible champions in that war of opinion which is hourly threatened. Its progress will be hastened or retarded by their development; and, for that moment only, the signal of war, with all its woeful features, awaits to assert its deadly power."

"Old Europe" no longer sleeps: she has awakened from her dreams of past glory to the direful realities of foreign war and civil strife. The signal has been given—the torch has been applied: and it is now impossible to say when the

elements which have been roused to action shall be quieted to peace, or what the flame shall consume before it is extinguished. Yet there is a nervous apprehension of the terrors of war on all men's minds which makes them shrink, even when the contest is unavoidable, from drinking of the cup that is forced into their hands. Greater causes of provocation have never been given than those which are now committing nations into mortal strife with each other; there is deadly conflict on all hands; yet, so unwilling or so ashamed are the conflicting parties to believe or acknowledge it, that they stand arrayed in bloody opposition without those solemn preliminaries which the usages of civilised nations have hitherto required. Never was there a more treacherous act than the assault of Sardinia upon Austria—an act in strict keeping with the well-known perfidy and ambition of the house of Savoy: never was there a more unprovoked aggression than that of Prussia upon Denmark. Yet both these acts were perpetrated without the formality of a declaration of war. It would seem, indeed, as though men were to learn the amount of infamy attaching to these deeds, even in the secret conviction of those who do them, by the avoidance of a custom which nations have considered it necessary to their honour to observe. A declaration of war would have involved a declaration of principles and a justification of the act; and these neither Charles Albert nor Frederick William could afford to give. In the absence of this declaration their warfare is simply so many acts of *brigandage*. The King of Sardinia covets the throne of Italy: the King of Prussia made a serious mistake with the people of his capital and was anxious to direct attention from his political error. The one, therefore, talks of a religious crusade for liberty, and the other of a sacred fatherland. Thus, under the sanction of holy names, they seek to hide their treachery and selfishness.

We sympathise deeply with the Italians in their struggle for liberty; but, if they owe their liberation to the efforts of Charles Albert, the banner of freedom will be put into their hand with as foul a blot as ever stained its purity. If Austria succumb to Sardinia, a blank will be left in the page of history where there should be a record of retributive compensations. Austria may indeed thus pay, in defeat, what she owes to Italy; but Sardinia would escape the punishment which the broken faith and dishonoured equity of national intercourse would seem to demand.

There has been a national anxiety on the part of most men to learn what were the designs of Russia; and now that there

is a pause in the absorbing interest which the events of the great Parisian movement has excited, attention is turned with increasing solicitude to the great monarch of the north. What is he doing—what does he meditate? An angry manifesto at the outbreak of the French revolution—a significant enquiry addressed to Prussia as to her designs upon Denmark, which doubtless has had its influence in stopping the career of General Wrangel—and, as it is said, the dismissal of the Sardinian ambassador from St. Petersburgh in dignified rebuke of the unkingly acts of his master. These are all the signs of political interest which Russia has hitherto exhibited. Most men are, with just reason, thankful for the neutrality which she has shown. If she had moved one foot in aggressive action, the peace of Europe would have been compromised beyond the possibility of redemption: the faint ray of hope which sometimes gleams across the darkened horizon of the world and through the wild clouds of its storms and tempests would have been extinguished. The very thankfulness which men have felt has, however, led them to conclusions as to her future policy, wherein we fear "the wish," and not the reality, is "father to the thought." The position which the czar occupies is one of two—either that of a dignified independence too strong in the consciousness of its resources to fear the efforts of French propagandism, and too noble to sacrifice the peace of others to the objects of a selfish ambition; or it is that of a far seeing, deeply-calculating policy which quietly waits its time, watching for the fitting opportunity in which a mighty scheme of aggrandisement can be carried into operation. The emperor has been much maligned: there are in his personal character and public bearing many elements of high nobility and generosity, and our sympathy with these would almost induce us to hope that the better motives assigned to the part which he is now taking are the true ones; but the emperor must also be regarded in another light—as the czar as well as the man. There are many things to which he is impelled by the conditions of his autocracy which he might be very willing to forego as an individual: he is the representative of a monarchical principle, which, existing in full force in Russia, derives the greater strength in its exercise by him from the fact that it is upon sufferance or in contempt elsewhere. He is the inheritor of a policy which is essentially national and characteristic of his race—which has been handed down from czar to czar as the heir loom of autocratic dignity—and which, in its coveted consummation, is desired as the *summum bonum*

of autocratic greatness. Towards the east and west this policy stretches forth its two-handed desire, and longs for the grasp which shall put it in possession of their wealth and luxury. The sunny skies and fertile lands of the south are the Russian's elysium—the mastership of the east the dream of his ambition. The statesman thinks of the power that will be acquired—the soldier of the enjoyment that will be secured in their conquest; and both of these ideas, acting on a national temperament which is at once essentially sensual and acquisitive, gives an irresistible tendency to the national policy. In following out this policy the emperor is only true to the traditionary ambitions of his family and the wish of his people. On these grounds, whatever our sympathies might induce us to hope, we are led to fear that the present silent attitude of Russia is ominous of evil and not of good. Let us hear what our author says. Speaking of Moldavia, Wallachia, Transylvania, Servia, Bosnia, and the adjacent countries, he remarks, in proof of the extension of Russian influence and the designs of Russian ambition :—

"The Greek Christian Church, adopted as the national form of Russia, has had immense effect upon those countries. That and the Slaval language are the powerful means by which Russian policy will find its way westward. It has already separated modern Greece from Turkey. Moldavia and Wallachia have been detached from Turkey and fallen into her grasp. Neither diplomacy nor arms can arrest its progress. Austrian ministers were ignorant of Turkish weakness until the Greek insurrection and the progress of the Russian arms to Varna..... When will a statesman rise up who, imperceptibly to themselves, will concentrate this heterogeneous mass of various nations, religions, and languages into one mass with the national feeling of independence, and prepare them to withstand the overwhelming force of a nation which otherwise will first overrun this country and afterwards threaten Europe? It may be said that the whole pressure of the north is on these countries of the Danube.

"The outbreak of Russia will, probably, be as victorious and irresistible as that of France: that Constantinople will fall to her there is but little doubt; nor can the conflicting elements of European policy prevent it, or rather they will facilitate its consummation. It is equally clear that she will not be allowed to retain quiet and undisturbed possession, but all resistance on land will be previously paralysed by her consummate address. After the deepest and most mature consideration of the bearings and tendency of the European courts, nothing else can be expected. The fear of France and recollection of former disasters, the great destruction of property and the loss of power and privilege of the aristocracy of the continent, make them sensitive to the highest degree. And they rally to a man round the principle which is opposed to the power most likely to disturb

and, perhaps, annihilate them. They are ignorant that so many fears and anxieties will bring on their own destruction from another quarter, and that successful conquest will be followed in its train by an assertion of all its rights of spoil and appropriation—the evils of successful ambition. The revolutionary tendency of France is the point upon which it is the policy of Russia to keep the undivided attention of Europe especially of those Governments upon whom she most relies for aid in carrying out her own ambitious projects."

Colonel Buller seems to feel that, in the present state of the discordant and conflicting interests of Europe, all that remains to her for the arrest of Russian ambition is to "prop up the tottering rampart of Moslemism" against her aggression. He argues, however, that this attempt must fail, because the fall of the Mahometan power is clearly predicted in Scripture, and because she has hitherto been unable to withstand, even though assisted by European courts, the assault of Russia. He says:—

"This power has followed her with a perseverance which knows no remission, in whose arms she now lies in all the helplessness of maiden weakness. It is true, Russia has called on others to behold the helpless state of the victim, with an appeal to reanimate the suffering patient; but she lingers on without even the power of making a testament. Where Austria ceased Russia began. Crimea and Bessarabia acknowledged her power—Moldavia and Wallachia followed. Servia shook off the chains of Mussulman superiority. Greece was torn from her, till the power of Russia's arms, in 1828, shook the whole fabric of empire to its foundation. Where will she at last find a resting place?—the doomed victim receive the death-blow? Russia has never ceased to be the most active agent in the work of decomposition. The rebel and the tyrant invoke her from afar: she readily responds to the cry of both, till, weakened by mutual slaughter and unsuccessful effort in throwing off the yoke of the Turk, they sink in their exhaustion into the arms of one who knows better how to make himself obeyed. Austria, aided by noble and gallant Poland and the warlike ardour of the Hungarians, sent the proud Moslem back within his natural bounds; but will she, Austria herself, be more successful in the hour of danger and distress, in making herself respected by a present friendly and terrible neighbour? Can Austria impose by her power—or can she command alliance to ward off the projects or attempts of the ambition of a great ally? Or has the fatal ulcer which has raged in the vitals of her Moslem neighbour began to extend to her own extremities? The answer to these questions is not far from a speedy solution, and Austria's turn may come next. Poland fallen!—Turkey falling!—and Austria, the neighbour of Russia."

These words were written, be it remembered, *six years ago*; and the events of the last three months have vindicated,

in a remarkable manner, their sagacity and verified the bases on which these political prophecies are formed. The question, with regard to Austria, is almost answered: the catastrophe which the colonel has foreseen is nearly consummated, though not exactly in the method predicted. If the neighbourhood of Russia to Austria has not been evidenced in acts of hostility, still, in the present desperate condition of that power, the neutrality of the autocrat has been nearly as dangerous; for it has invited, by an appearance of moderation, many within the range of his grasp who otherwise would have rallied round the standard which they have hitherto acknowledged. Thus Austria, by an almost imperceptible process of abstraction, is daily weakening in strength; whilst Russia reckons upon the deserters as her future subjects. In all this, Austria is at this very moment suffering retributively for her conduct in the annexation of Cracow, and the atrocities of the peasant insurrection of Gallicia which she fostered for her own purposes. The punishment of Russia will one day come, because she has partaken the crime; for it should be remembered that, into the first, Austria was led by her for the furtherance of a selfish policy; and that, in the guilt of the second the Emperor of Russia shares, having permitted the excesses of the serfs as a check to the power of the feudal aristocracy—the only thing which he fears. The colonel justly observes that "the annexation of Cracow was a pause between the protocol and the cannon-ball." It is Austria who is at present paying the expense and furnishing the food of this direful instrument of misery and death. Russia listens to the sound of the artillery in apparent apathy; but, whilst it is booming, one after another of the sections which compose the heterogeneous mass of the Austrian force is stealing from her ranks, drawn homewards by the sympathies of new-born nationalities, the revived traditions of ancient glory, or the resuscitated associations of tribe and race for a long while dormant; so that in a little while the house of Hapsburgh will have nothing left of empire but the name, and will be totally disabled from opposing the designs of Russia on the Sclavonic tributaries which have owned her sway.

The political prophecy of Canning was, that the next great European war would be a war of principles. The skirmish which precedes this mighty conflict has already commenced, and it appears to us that the two battle-fields on which it will ultimately be fought are Italy and the East. "The principles which divide the world at present (as Colonel

Buller observes) are, taken in the extreme, denominated religion and infidelity, *authority* and reason, conservation and destruction, revolution and the *status quo*." We may add that these principles take two forms of development—ecclesiastical despotism as opposed to rationalistic lawlessness—absolute monarchy as antagonistic to democratic supremacy. Rome has hitherto been the exponent of one and Constantinople of the other: thitherwards, as by the natural impulse of an instinctive policy, the several parties engaged in this great struggle hasten. When the conflict reaches Rome, it will be to the positive peril of all ecclesiastical authority, in whatever modified form it may be exhibited: when it turns towards Constantinople, it will probably result in the absorption of all monarchical power into one great autocracy on the one hand, and its rejection in an almost universal republicanism on the other; and if so, then in a final contest, hand to hand for life or death, between these two great elements. Whilst we write the noise of the coming strife has already been heard in the streets of Rome: the hand of the messenger of evil has struck at the portals of the Vatican; and, if the Pope trembles whilst he hears the sound, to the forebodings which it suggests must be added the bitter recollection of having, by his own mistaken policy, smoothed the way for the enemy.*

We took occasion to remark, in a former article, that that policy was perfectly suicidal, and that if Rome must have a constitution she must also have an emperor or a tribune as well as a pope. Subsequent events have, in part, justified the accuracy of the remark. The Pope, led away by the impulses of a generous nature or deceived by the philosophical sophistries of the day, has mistaken the nature of the charge entrusted to his care. His office was to preserve the exercise of the ecclesiastical authority intact alike from the sanction and the questioning of rationalism. The moment that this authority suffered an alliance with the democratic element its integrity was destroyed, for the true expression of this element is republicanism; and however Romanism, by a desperate system of concession, may be *accommodated* to Republicanism, it can never properly *co-exist* with it. Moreover, the right of approval supposes the right to question; and close upon the heels of this follow the creeds, which make obedience a matter of conventional compact and not of duty.

* In Rome a collision is imminent. "God grant (cries the *Constitutionnel*) that blood may not already have flowed in the pontifical city."—*Evening Mail*, May 31.

The Pope fraternised at Rome with democracy, and what has been the result? His people have hailed him with *vivas* whilst he was in progress; but, it is said, imprisoned him in his palace when he presumed to stop. They have quietly threatened him that, if he will not go forward, he must cease to be a temporal prince; and, by the time these pages are in print, it is not improbable that they will have put the threat in execution. The conduct of the Pope was imitated by his priests. In Paris the *soutane* fraternised with the *blouse* yet reeking with the smoke of the barricades: trees of liberty were blessed, incensed, and besprinkled, with all the reverence and the same formalities with which God is worshipped; and the republican mummery was generally closed by blasphemous speeches in the mouths of men clothed in priestly garments. One likened the tree of liberty which he was blessing to the cross of Christ: another, performing this silly act near the opera-house, compared the fraternisation of religion and republicanism which the surrounding crowd was witnessing to the harmonies of the theatrical music which the vicinity suggested to their recollection: another spoke of this revolutionary outbreak as a manifestation of deity. Time would fail, indeed, for the repetition of all these priestly follies—to call them by no worse a name—which have been at once the disgrace of the Romish clergy and the cause of sorrow to every reverent man.

Even the Pope has placed himself in positions which are most equivocal. We are told, for instance, that he was horrified when the Roman populace demanded that he should declare war against Austria; and the horror which he felt was lauded as a manifestation of Christian piety. A horror of war is, we should hope, an instinct of Christian charity; but we are at a loss to reconcile the Pope's reluctance in complying with a *form* with his eagerness in accomplishing the *fact*. He had stirred up the spirit of hostility—he had permitted the levy of volunteers—he had blessed their colours—he had ordered the march of his Swiss and sent them forth with a parting benediction. Did he suppose that it was to a boy's play? Did he suppose that the weapons which they carried would be unstained with blood? If so, he paid no great compliment to Roman valour; but he was sending them to a crusade, and he knew it, for none has preached it so loudly as himself; and, whilst he thus unmuzzled the dog of war, to be horrified when asked, according to the usages of honour, t apprize the hapless victim of the fate that awaited him, is an exercise of conscientious scrupulosity which we cannot un-

derstand. The only thing which we know that can match it is the tender conscience of the pious Odo, Bishop of Baieux, who fought with a mace because the canons of the Church forbad ecclesiastics to fight with the sword: he might break a head—this was according to due order!—but a sword thrust was abomination!

The design of Russia upon the East is no novelty. As it is the power of England that would be ultimately affected by her success, England becomes prospectively the most formidable foe to its attainment. The policy of Russia has, therefore, been to prepare for her resistance. As a preliminary, she has endeavoured to place England in a false position with other nations, and so to isolate us as to render a defensive alliance with them neither practicable nor desirable. This step in her policy was effected, as our author thinks, by the famous treaty of 1840, entered into ostensibly for the purpose of recovering the Ottoman power and influence in Syria. This treaty the colonel regards as a consummate specimen of Russian diplomacy, by which war was rendered impossible when war was neither compatible with her interests nor her finances; in the terms of which also she has laid the foundation for strife between England and France whenever it may suit the purpose of either to refer to it as a cause of quarrel; and by which, moreover, in the assumption of an apparent moderation and disinterestedness, she beguiled the general gaze from the domestic cruelties and tyrannies which she was enacting.

Russia has a navy, but no sufficient outlet for it: whoever looks at the map will see this. Accordingly she covets a port in the Mediterranean: she longs for India, and her readiest way to it is through Turkey. The true basis of all her operations will, therefore, be Constantinople. The Bosphorus, and the Dardanelles! These are the great objects of her ambition. On this point she has never ceased to keep her eye. By the peace of Kainarji, Azof and Taganrog were ceded to Russia: this brought her to the shores of the Baltic. In 1785 she took possession of Crimea, which had before been separated from Turkey: the peace of Jassi extended her possessions, in 1792, to the banks of the Dniester. The treaty of Bucharest gave her the banks of the Pruth and Bessarabia: that of Adrianople put her in possession of the delta formed by the mouths of the Danube, several military positions, a vast addition of coast, and the power of isolating Turkey by the establishment of a quarantine: she wants nothing but Belgrade to complete her command of the Danube. Thus, by

gradually abstracting the principalities of the Danube from the rule of the Ottoman, and pushing forward her military stations, she has, by slow degrees, approached the object of her desire. Once in possession of Constantinople, she can pursue her conquests east or west at her pleasure. In the meanwhile, every step she takes in this direction brings her nearer to some vital point of England's empire; and though for a time it may accord with her interests and the peaceful spirit of English enterprise and government to avoid collision, yet sooner or later the boundary which marks the *terminus* of forbearance must be passed, and these two great powers stand face to face to contest in deadly conflict the principles of which they are the exponents. Such, at any rate, is the opinion of our author, and we think that he is not far off in his conjecture.

The absorption of Poland, which Russia is gradually accomplishing, is part of her Pan-Sclavonic policy. From the days of Catherine, down to the present, this scheme has been pursued with an unity and steadiness of design that nothing but Russian perseverance could have maintained, and nothing but Russian diplomacy could have upheld. The partition of Poland was the great political crime of the day, and the wrongs of Poland have exhausted the resources of eloquence in describing them; with all this, so well has Russia managed, that no hand has been stretched out to the rescue: even the last gallant struggle and fruitless victories of Skrzynecki under the walls of Warsaw won nothing from the admiring world but a helpless sympathy. Recent events have taught us that, however the nobles of Poland may suffer in this absorption, the serfs will be gainers in its consummation. The one virtue of the Pole is indomitable valour—his vices, alas! are "legion." The *Faucher* of Posen is a counterpart to the ancient Taborite of Bohemia; and, if the accounts in the *Times* are to be credited, a greater monster does not exist than the Polish peasant unfettered in the doing of his will. Czartoriski has returned to Paris in the deep conviction that nationality in the present condition of the Poles is neither desirable nor practicable; and the romance of history, graced by Sobieski's chivalrous gallantry and Kosciusko's fall, has received a rude shock in the relation of crimes without a motive and barbarity without excuse. The Poles once stood high in the estimation and sympathies of generous men: they are now the objects of their execration.

Colonel Buller writes like a soldier who is more accustomed to the use of the sword than the pen; but, though this is evi-

dent in some inaccuracies of composition, still the characteristic influence of his profession over the forms of his thought is strikingly manifest. His remarks are always tranchant, full of fire and vigour: his illustrations full of manly beauty, and some of his sentiments as forcibly expressed as they are loftily conceived. His book presents a novelty—a political treatise made up of original ideas, every page of which contains matter for serious reflection. At once historical and prophetical, it deals with the past in a manner which shows the author to be well and deeply read, and with the future by predictions which the events of every day are now verifying. We feel that this is no mean praise, but we are honest in its expression. It is a work which will not be popular, for it requires very careful attention in its perusal; but we believe that it will remain in the libraries of thinking men when the ephemeral productions on the same subject are forgotten. Before we part from it we will quote the following passage as being, especially at this time, full of deep and solemn interest:—

"The monied interest, or what in modern days is termed the *noblesse financière*, struggling for place amongst that of the land, and in unhallowed league with them against obtrusive poverty, is preparing unconsciously, and, we may add, precipitating society into a vortex from which only it can rescue itself by means of one of the most dangerous, diffusive, and comprehensive convulsions which ever shook the world. Steam and the railway—glorious and beneficial as they appear on the superficial view of their workings—will be accelerating and subordinating agents. Legislation in civilized countries, at war with those whom God has declared 'shall never cease out of the land,' with whom the question is—not how the needy are to be provided for by the means which Providence has been lavish in bestowing on more favoured classes, but how they are to be got rid of—in England, Belgium, and Prussia, this portentous question comes home close to the doors of wealth and government. In Spain, the stand so long made by Don Carlos was owing entirely to the effectual support he received from a peasantry who were pauperised, famished, and degraded by the revolution—who then took their share (on its success) of suffering amongst their fellows in other countries. Commercial and landed wealth, in deadly contest, foresee the demands of the pertinacious enemy. The latter will be forced into the field by the course of legislation which, in proposing adequate measures, is ignorant how to meet, or dares not face, the difficulties of coming events, dreaming, we are afraid, of the days of ancient serfage. In Paris, the land of revolution, we saw, not long ago, 'establishments for making soup out of oatmeal and horseflesh.' Everywhere, even amongst the higher classes, numbers are increasing, without any apparent prospect of provision for the younger branches. Some great scheme of emigration, or some awful

scourge, either of war or pestilence, will be alone capable of solving the intricate problem. The line of demarcation between rich and poor becomes more defined every day; 'a bold peasantry, its country's pride,' as Goldsmith truly and beautifully says, is becoming more and more a dream—a thing of the past. Education has not caused it, but education has caused people to enquire and criticise more clearly the relative duties of rich and poor: it has made them forbearing, but sullen: it has checked violent outbreaks, but it has taught them, alas! combination, and to watch the progress of events and await the hour of decision. Churches are building by wealthy proprietors as a means of protection, and giving a readier access to the destitute million for the purpose of teaching them to suffer religiously. Education committees are forming; but upon whom is education to do its work?—upon grown-up individuals, brought up under the sting of poverty and its reproach and suffering. The feelings of the fathers will be inherited by a famishing progeny. The great and never-ceasing movement in progress will not wait long enough for the improved feelings generated by religion and education to be apparent in a future generation—man's heart has been too long hardened—the evil is too deeply rooted and we fear not to be eradicated. The exaltation of an excited race, peculiarly characteristic of the age, will find its vent before the means of tempering it are at hand. Emigration or war—social war—the most deadly, dreadful, and impairing contest that can take place in the world—will solve the great dilemma, unless the catastrophe be averted by extraordinary legislative exertion. The line of demarcation between rich and poor becomes wider every day: luxury increasing, on a calculated epicurean measure of enjoyment, in the presence of racking want. This awful and comprehensive subject would exceed our limits, and we satisfy ourselves with a slight allusion to a dark, solemn, and undefined future, pregnant with great events."

This passage is full of truths which may be unpalatable, but which are too manifest on every hand to be denied. In reading it, the words "*too late*" again present themselves to our minds. Much is in operation for the bettering of man's social and moral condition, but it is not in this generation that the fruit can be reaped; and will the great tide of events which flows unceasingly onward to its given destination stay its progress till they are gathered in? We fear not. The culture of the soil has been delayed too long: the seed has been sown when the true season of sowing was past: some vegetation there will doubtless be—some gleams of sunshine and remnants of summer heat—but the winter's gloom will overtake us ere the crop be ripe, and men will learn that they have begun their work *too late*. In face of every legislature stands a woe-worn spectre whose case compels attention, and whose hopeless aspect paralizes all effort: it is the poverty of the labouring classes! How the condition of these classes is

to be amended is the great social problem of the day. Theorists of every kind try their hand at its solution, but whilst it is in course of demonstration the iron is eating into the flesh; and when the true answer is found, if ever indeed it is to be discovered, it is more than probable it will be too late for application. Side by side with the progress of endurance rises the spirit of resistance, and the point must some day be reached where the one will find its limit and the other its maturity.

It is one characteristic of the day that whilst evils are patent their remedy is practically unattainable. The theories of Socialism, the wild systems of Louis Blanc and his disciples, the doctrines of Chartism, all derive their strength and their hold upon men's minds from the incontrovertible facts which they advance: they point to sufferings and wrongs which none can deny, and make their appeals to sympathies which are possessed in common; but they run wild when they endeavour to ascertain the cause and become Utopian when they enunciate the remedy: they think that the cause lies in the defective condition of the social compact, and, therefore, they ask for class legislation as a sovereign cure for the evil. Every one perceives that the miseries of which the lower classes of society complain are real miseries; but every effort of class legislation for their amelioration is more or less a failure, because they are dependent upon conditions of humanity which no legislation can reach. Exorbitant wealth is most surely followed by pauperism. As long as riches constitute the *summum bonum* of any one class it must entail in its acquisition great poverty upon others; but this is dependent upon a part of man's constitution, which is not the noblest, and which is receiving a fuller development in this than in any preceding age—we mean selfishness. No legislation can provide against this, and therefore no legislation can help its victims. If a man, in the selfish gratification of any passion, breaks a law, he may be met and punished; but if selfishness becomes the system of the day, and is manifested in such forms as the law permits and as statesmen consider to be necessary to the greatness of a nation, how can legislation touch it? Now, these are days in which the political strifes and struggles of men have but one object—the aggrandizement of their class. These are days, moreover, when wealth is the thing most desired and most honoured. In its attainment all energies are absorbed and the nobler elements of our nature sacrificed: it is the great Moloch of the age, in the worship of which the fairest offspring of the human heart

and mind are passed through the fire without a sigh. The member for West Surrey observed in the debate on the Navigation Bill, with as much truth as wit, "that all sages in all ages had pronounced certain dogmata by which they had become celebrated. One had said, 'Know thyself;' another had said, 'Pleasure is the greatest good;' another, 'Virtue is the greatest good:' but the great dogma of the present day, reduced to its smallest dimensions, was, 'Buy for a penny, sell for a pound.'" It is too true: it is the mean and selfish doctrine for which the League organized its dishonest mission, and paid with lavish prodigality its successful missionary. The cry was, "Cheap food for the poor!" Was this the end desired? No such thing. The real object was, "Greater profit for the manufacturer;" and, that he may acquire these, agitation is again at work. England is now required, with something more than gentle force, to become a proselyte to this new doctine: no matter what she may have to give up of honour—no matter what she may lose in integrity—what she may sacrifice in faith, provided she make money. This maxim, "Put money i' thy purse"—the hybrid offspring of the mill and chandler's-shop—is fast eating out whatever was noble amongst nations. "Peace, for the sake of humanity," is a cant word of the day. "Peace, for the sake of wealth," is its real meaning. Though peace in itself be a priceless blessing, yet the desire for its maintenance may become the expression of an unmitigated selfishness; and such we believe it now to be on the part of many. It is an ominous condition in any state when acknowledged principles of honour and faith are to be quietly abandoned, because the cost of their maintenance will require a sacrifice of ease or enjoyment on the part of the wealthier classes. If we mistake not, many of the manufacturers of this country are ready for this abandonment, and will pay any agitator very handsomely who will enforce its necessity.

A contemporary writer has quoted the following observation of Burke in illustrating the spirit of the day:—

"The age of chivalry is gone: that of sophists, economists, and calculators has succeeded, and the glory of Europe is extinguished for ever. Never more shall we behold that generous loyalty to rank, and see that proud submission, that dignified obedience, that subordination of the heart, which kept alive, even in servitude itself, the spirit of an exalted freedom. The unbought grace of life, the cheap defence of nations, the nurse of manly sentiments, is gone. It is gone —that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honour which felt a stain like a wound, which inspired courage whilst it mitigated ferocity,

which ennobled whatever it touched, and under which vice itself lost half of its evil by losing all its grossness."

The quotation is most apt to the times. It was written in the contemplation of one revolution—it is descriptive of the causes of another: it is the lament of a high-minded man over a moral death in which the politicians and economists of this day exult, and it accounts for the degradation into which the heretofore noble of every class are daily sinking. Honour amongst kings, faith amongst nations, are at a discount. Whilst, on the one hand, monarchs are seen to uphold their power by acts of treachery or turn craven in the hour of danger, on the other, the virtue of allegiance is trampled under foot. Where men were wont to die in defence of a principle they now purchase life, and sometimes infamy, by the sacrifice of all that is high and honourable. When the Duchess of Orleans was in the Chamber of Deputies, shaming, with her woman's courage, the frightened spirits of her husband's house, one cry of devotion from a loyal heart might have saved the dynasty; but it was wanting, and this, too, in France! But what could be expected when one of the noblest warriors she ever encountered lies pining in a prison, the victim of a solemn pledge given by a prince and broken in shameless indifference to honour by the nation in whose name it was offered? If Louis Philippe complain of the defection of men, both high and low, sworn to allegiance, he will only find in it the true reflection of that perjured act by which Abd-el-Kader became and remains the prisoner of France.

Lord John Russell has recently remarked, that *the middle and lower classes are not generally desirous of a greater measure of Parliamentary Reform!* The remark has been much canvassed. His lordship is right and he is wrong. He is right if by this greater measure he means that which Mr. Joseph Hume and his tail are desirous of obtaining for their own selfish purposes: he is wrong if by this remark he would have it to be understood that the restless spirit which is finding a place in the thoughts and hearts of these classes every where else is unwelcome to them here. The League and its purposes, in the new career of agitation which is opened to needy adventurers, are too palpably dishonest to deceive the classes who are earnestly canvassed for support; and it is a libel upon the virtue to suppose for one moment that any particle of pure patriotism enters into the composition of this disreputable confederation. The points for which the country is now to be agitated are, with a very slight difference, the very points which have long been advocated by poorer men

of greater honesty and as much ability as the clique which has now adopted them; and, whilst there is enough of political charlatanism in the missionaries of this new-born agitation to make us utterly disgusted with their work, there is something contemptible in the way in which they are stepping forward, now that there is a chance of a treaty with Chartism, to take the fruits of the victory out of the hands of those who have fought the battle, and whom they have ridiculed when suffering under the heat of the conflict. It is the best thing, however, that could have happened for Feargus O'Connor, as he now stands in contact with Cobden as the greater political hero and honester man of the two.

The theory of the purity of election is, after all, but a theory, and will never be anything else. We may have universal suffrage and vote by ballot—we may shorten the periods of parliamentary session and lessen the qualifications of parliamentary members; but we never, by these measures, can reach the corruption of the human heart, which has more to do with the matter than any legislative enactments—which *will* find an outlet, and which is perfectly indifferent to the form of development which they prescribe. If, in addition to these items in the notable scheme of parliamentary reform which is now to be forced on the country by the wealth of the manufacturers, we should be unlucky enough to find the Chartist plan of remuneration to the members also adopted—(and who can say that it will not be?)—we shall then come to the lowest degree in the scale of our degradation. The House of Commons will cease to be an assembly of high-minded educated gentlemen, and England will thenceforth be at the mercy of men without principle, as they are without information and without worth.

But though it is something like a mockery to deal in argument with these theories as the results of honest resolves and wise reflections—something like an insult to the good sense of the middle and lower classes to suppose that they can contemplate the objects which they propose as sufficient compensation for the social evils of which all are conscious—still they are a *bonus* to the revolutionary spirit that is abroad, and will be gladly accepted by many as an instalment who would utterly despise them as an ultimate and final payment. And herein lies the mischief of this agitation. Lord John Russell is mistaken if he does not see that, on this ground, any measure of Parliamentary reform will be acceptable which ensures a further progression: he is mistaken, too, if he supposes that the deep feeling of wrong unmerited, and suffering unoared for,

which seems to pervade the labouring classes of other lands, finds no responsive echo in the hearts of our poorer population here. The middle classes may be conservative, for they, at least, have something to keep; but the lowest class of all, too long neglected by wealthy landlords, and ground into the dust by the iron machinery of a system which uses up human strength and health in the acquisition of enormous wealth, with little thought of the misery that is entailed—these believe that nothing short of self-legislation can help them. They are too clear-sighted not to see that the theories of these monied agitators will not ameliorate their condition; yet sufficiently reckless to snatch at any weapon that may be offered without caring for the hand that offers it—provided only that it be a weapon of offence and that it will help them one step onward in the attainment of their object. This is the weapon that the League is forging.

We know not whether the members of the League understand, or care for, the mischief they are doing. It is ever the folly and the judgment of those who, for their own interests, destroy existing institutions, that there is always a point which they never see—where they must cease to attack and commence to defend—only to be ultimately stricken down by the means of aggression which they themselves have furnished. The crusade at present is against the aristocracy and its influence: when these fall, the plutocracy will stand face to face alone with the people. Is there that strength of virtue—that cleanness of hand and honesty of dealing—that tender consideration for inferiors and gentle treatment of dependents, that shall leave the people no ground to ask a reckoning and afford no cause of fear to those who are required to give it? We think not. When the palaces of the nobles fall, the mills must follow. When the aristocrat is stricken to the ground, because he possesses the accidents of birth and rank, the millionaire will shortly lie by his side, because he is guilty of the crime of wealth. As these unwise agitators succeed in preparing the one result for those above them, they inevitably secure the other for themselves. "Go to now, ye rich men; weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped up treasure together for the last days..... Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton: ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter." (James v.)

ART. VI.—1. *Organization du Travail.* Par M. LOUIS BLANC. Paris. 1848.
2. *M. Chevalier's Reply to Louis Blanc.* Paris. 1848.
3. *The Rights of Labour.* London: C. Knight. 1848.

THE question of labour and its right organization has assumed an aspect of such great political importance that it cannot be passed over without subjecting us to the charge of apathy or neglect. That it has assumed a new mode and style is evident from the title of a work we are about incidently and by way of digression to look into—M. Louis Blanc's "Organization of Labour." We need say little here of the author, for both he and his writings, his principles and his defeats, are now well known; but, be he what he may, there is that in his book which commands our attention.

The rights of labour are of the most sacred and solemn kind; and no man, worker or no worker, can, with any plea of justification, refuse to hear the great cry that arises throughout the length and breadth of the land. They cry aloud for help—for labour—a "fair day's wages for a fair day's work"—for work, even at the smallest remuneration, rather than be idle: and, because they have cried long in vain, we begin to find something like a very alarming agitation pervading the masses. For, although in detail rioters and mobs are only like the wild cattle goaded into Smithfield or the shambles, yet they *are* goaded and they *may* do danger: and as we have seen that apathy and indifference have met with a terrible retribution in several instances, it is necessary to consider the grounds of their discontent, if only from the meaner motive of self-preservation.

Let it be remembered that, in thus considering the condition of the artizan and the labourer, it is no concession that we make; and we can have no right to compliment ourselves when we only grant that as a favour which he can demand as a right. In this position of things, then, the convention of class vanishes before the sternness of the object we have in view, while the muttering of the thunder in the air must not be unregarded.

We would gladly behold any rational system, propounded for the amelioration of the labourer's condition, acted upon; but, as we are conscious that troublous times produce ideas most Utopian, which are not suited to the condition and rapid movements of man—so also, before we accept any such theory, we would look to it narrowly, so that we may not act hastily upon it, lest we make that which is already bad—worse.

It is also to be lamented that the evil is so general—so universal. It is not an evil of a class or of a locality: it is no parish matter—no matter of finance: it is a subject for statesmen to dwell upon and ponder deeply: it is one that vitally affects the peace of the three kingdoms; for, as anarchy is now stalking about in every part of Europe, so if we, who have peace among us, do not endeavour, in some way or other, to preserve it, it will be too late for us when we shall be reminded amid the blood and smoke of insurrection that the hour is passed when even one Christian voice might have been lifted up in so momentous a time.

In a state of society where all is in gradual progress, which advances onward to a dim futurity apparently without guidance or aim, one is apt to be confused in endeavouring to look upon the tendency of "movements" or the unsettled state of the "times;" therefore, while endeavouring to catch hold of any one phase that may have somewhat of a familiar aspect about it and thus draw out of it some little of the important secret wrapped therein, behold, it is either left behind or absorbed in the whirl of other thousand circumstances that vary and change each hour, till at last, in a kind of hopeless despair, one looks around as a man might gaze into some howling Maelstrome: up from the boiling deep, after a time, comes the wreck of a theory, fine and plausible at first, now woefully broken up. Anon, some portion, an unsolved formula, floats on the surface which we remember to have had its day; and, finally, as the disjointed philo-sophisms appear and disappear, having at last no mark or sign left upon them, other newer things take their place, and the powers of the mind are baffled and absolutely beaten by the incongruous "sound and fury" they have caused.

While, after all, there exists in all minds, more or less, an idea as regards the correctness of measures, reforms of abuses, or expediencies for unforeseen catastrophes that throw the current of events from their quiet and regular circle of motion—yet the demands are upon such a gigantic scale that the social evils of twenty years back now appear in all the frightful exaggerations of an endemic: it has grown and gathered—this twenty year old evil: it has become a kind of moral Frankenstein—so that that which was once to be mastered and wielded, even as clay is plastic under the hands of the potter, is now a structure of such magnitude and distortion withal that it menaces the heads of those who would endeavour to prop the overhanging and tremulous walls.

Day after day, and week after week, does the condition of the labouring and manufacturing classes come before us, and each

time with quintupled force. It stares in upon us out of the yawning abysses of the coal pit—out of the dusty windows of Manchester and Bolton factories—through "Health of Towns" exposure, and Lord Ashley's Ten Hour Bills—out of the sordid cabin of the hungered peasant—out of the dusty and quiet looms of Spitalfields—those left from the fires of the last hard winter, as many were used for that purpose—glaring with dread and fiery eyes upon us like a crouching monster ready to spring at our throats, prepared to destroy in the thirst for vengeance; while the neglect they feel and the privations already endured have roused to ferocity the most terrible passions of their nature.

We behold in all the great cities and towns of the land of England, and France even, men by hundreds of thousands who sit idle in the market place because they have nothing to do—because, while they cry out for labour, there is no labour for them. "Monopoly" (say some) has destroyed the golden egg. "Competition," on the other hand, has glutted the markets, and the return of the little labour that exists is confined in its circle and crippled in its means. As it is, their capital has been drained from the small masters, who, by the enterprize of the wealthier, are now unable to cope with them; so that the twenty men in one factory or workshop have been paralysed by the labour of two hundred in the larger, combined with their machinery also; and these twenty add to the paupers of the parish and press upon the tradesman or the citizen; or else they add to the lawless mass who are ready to join in any insurrection that may give them either the right they claim or the revenge they pant for.

Chartism for instance—that rabid and now exciting theme—is a banner and a by-word under which men without motive but the curse of idleness, which makes them do mischief when they can do no better, rally round and gather in threatening numbers to the destruction of credit and the stoppage of trade. You cannot annihilate the word or the principle otherwise than by giving men something else and better to employ their thoughts. If the chisel and the hammer, the spade or the shuttle, be taken out of their hands, and the voices of wives and children cry in their ears for food and clothing, the half maddened man beholds in Chartism that which his dire distress sanctifies: it becomes to him a sacred theory—a crusade that he believes to be almost divine; and in this excited and irritated state he commits outrages against laws and people which lead him to the prison or the hulks. Lost to all sense of danger—hardened to the almost stifled crying of his con-

science—he becomes the more criminal, until his end—pauperism on one hand and felony on the other—stares upon him. Like a victim fluttering before the jaws of the serpent, he has no power to turn back; for he has been forced forward by circumstances beyond his control, and over half the land operations are stopped and the operatives have become insurgents, or are prepared to become such the instant the word is given.

There were men in Lyons—men clad in blouses—men of revolutions and barricades, who a few days ago rose up "with fire in their eyes and muskets in their hands, determined to live by working or to die fighting." Significant and terrible words these: these are the words which the points of the Charter hide: they will burst forth—they have already done so. These men say to the capitalist, the manufacturer, the trader—"Which do you choose? Without us, you, the capitalist, would have no gold—without us, you, the manufacturer, would keep your raw material to rot on the shelves of your factory—and you, the trader, would be forced to close your shop and lead as profitless and barren a life as we do, in tears and misery. Behold us now! '*L'œil ardent et le fusil à la main, vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant.*' Choose (they cry) which we shall do!"

To this what can be said? We answer, these insurrections of labour—which do not aim at dethroning the Queen or overturning the Government or in plundering the city—we answer them with turning out horse and foot guards, and with all the power of the civil magistrate, and this checks their fury; for to give them way in the mad riotous manner they have risen up would be criminal in the extreme: and when they are checked—when they are held back awhile—things fall again into their old, quiet, jog-trot order: men relapse into tame indifference. They will not see that this suffices not for these men, and they thus compel them to act with secrecy—with more energy; and, consequently, there is more to be feared from them or for them: they are and will be the victims; or, if they are not, let it be looked to that we, standing on the defensive, become not on the other hand victims.

Mr. Buller said, in 1843:—"Side by side appear, in fearful and unnatural contrast, the greatest amount of opulence and the most appalling mass of misery." This is a fact that cannot, unfortunately, be denied. We say unfortunately, because preponderance of wealth on the one hand does not, of *necessity*, constitute such harrowing destitution on the other; for, on the contrary, this great wealth is the matrix or the motive power of industry—of peasant comfort and of artisan prosperity: it is

the food of enterprise and the creator of great markets. The evil lies in the *working* of this capital—in the antagonistic relations which various grades of labour stand to each other. It is melancholy to reflect, however, that this very fact causes between rich and poor such an immeasurable hatred and a discontent little likely, in the present constitution of things, to be in any manner destroyed or even weakened.

Pitt has also said—"The State ought to give the working classes either employment or bread." This sentence is remarkable, inasmuch as it only shows that men, however cautious, are, in some extreme cases, so much thrown from their guard: for this was Pitt's exception and not his rule. Pitt was never a legislator for the poor. But in that case also, while conservation protects the existing, it is forgotten that a sentence like the above, coming from such an authority, gives only fresh power to bolder innovations at each new time, until at last it takes the shape and force of a dogma; and men who are the demagogues of the time turn to these triumphantly and say —"Behold, then !—if you refuse what we demand, or deny the necessity that exists with *us*, which we are capable of proving by ocular demonstration—behold the words of your *own* authority !—and that speaks more forcibly *for* us and *to* you than all the charters and petitions in the world can."

In this expression, and its like, then, lies the whole germ of such a prodigiously *Catholic* theory as Louis Blanc's; for if the State is bound "to give the people bread or labour," then the State has also the power and the right, if it chose, to take labour from the hands of those accustomed to create it—from the machinist and the weaver, from the spinner, the merchant, and the artisan: the State, therefore, becomes the director-general of mechanical employments. What is the consequence? The statesman, who can in his cabinet look over the destinies of nations, who plays with kingdoms as he would at chess, finds himself at a loss how to cut out for each man his portion of daily work. At the outset he discovers that diplomacy and manufactures are not by any means alike: he will then commit those gross and ruinous blunders of which inexperience in every grade is always guilty. Grant that he may have under him men he can depend upon—agents who will act for him while they again act each in his department: they are, however, but as the taskmasters of a great factory; and as they have no comprehension beyond their office, and do not produce with relation to the competitive industry of the world, and have no apprehension of those abstract principles that rule and govern labour—such as demand and supply, deeming merely that the

article has only to be "made," while to "sell it" is the work of others—the whole land at that rate may become producers, until there are at last no consumers for their goods; and while Manchester and Sheffield, Bradford and Newcastle, produce cotton, cutlery, cloth, and coals, the agriculturist finds himself in a dilemma for the want of markets for his produce, or for any other produce, which amounts to the same thing: the glutting of one commodity obstructs the free course of the other. The scheme of St. Simon—that the highest power should have dominion over industrial operations—proves itself to be as fallacious as it would be ruinous.

We have already said that this revived Chartism has not all and every one who shouts for it either disciples or proselytes. It is some industrial motive, we repeat, that calls crowds in such tumultuous aggregate. It would, however, be a just thing that the consequences of their leaders' inflammatory speeches should be visited upon them, in the shape of being compelled to restore to the shopkeeper the value of the property he has lost by outrage or robbery. Nine-tenths of the men who crowd the streets know nothing of the points they cry for: they do it on Pickwick's principle of hallooing with the largest mob. How many of them are ignorant of the very words they utter? —and how many of them are merely out on brigandage? With such, all measures of coercion may be with fairness used—the preservation of public order and the protection of trade being of the most vital importance; but if the shopkeeper is obliged to live in continual alarm—to lose his time while "specialling". —he will grow tired of it, as, by this time, are the National Guards of Paris. It is ruinous to his business, until at last he turns his eyes to the vacillating and dilatory measures which Parliament unhappily only talk over, till the torrent gathering itself against the fragile obstruction, in its overwhelming course, desolates the country.

Let us take a few sentences from M. Louis Blanc's book, which, like those epigrammatic "sayings" of popular men, are intended to be very pregnant with meaning; yet, unfortunately for their promulgator, and perhaps the better for us, we shall find, can with no great difficulty be reduced to complete absurdity:—"Is the poor man a member or an enemy of society? We answer for him—he finds the soil everywhere around him pre-occupied."

But we ask, do the Irish emigrants who, in the harvest, come yearly to England, find the soil pre-occupied when they procure employment here, and are enabled to take home sufficient money to live the remainder of the season in their cabins?

Or, out of the thousands who come over, year after year, how many of them never return, but are absorbed in the different towns and cities among our own industrial poor, obtaining labour and comfortable homes? Do *they* find the soil pre-occupied?

Again it is asked—"Can he (the poor man) sow the earth for his own account? No: because the right of the first occupant has become the right of property."

Very well, we say: but is it to be wished that the poor man *should* sow the earth on his own account? In that case, we retort the charge of selfishness against the theorist for the implied desire to do so. Would you, M. Louis Blanc, have us a nation of cotters, each living on his own glebe; and, if so, what would be the consequence? Can you destroy in the heart of man the passions of envy and covetousness, or curb the power of the stronger? The sun may shine, too, and the rain may fall upon the fruitful lands of one, while a neighbour, not many miles off, finds his seed perish of drought or rot with superabundance of moisture. In such a case, men can scarcely help each other, and this very want on one hand and aid on the other will destroy your equality at once. We will not say a word as to the intellectual grandeur which such a system would completely eradicate among men—we will not say a word on that head, although M. Chevalier has done so, and eloquently—on the arts annihilated—on the sciences lost; for then we should see the darkness of selfish ignorance coming again over the whole race of man. The face of the Creator would be obscured; for out of our egoism how could we behold it? The boors of Teniers would be noble gentlemen in comparison to what the poor man would become, if he *had* the right to sow the earth *for his own account* solely.

Besides, the right of property is the right of protecting others. The poor man can find employment from him who has already occupied the soil: it is neither pre-occupation nor is it—(we pray humbly to God that it be not so)—the over-population of our land; and this leads us for a moment to another portion, where competition is considered to be an evil. In this wise he says—"Is competition the means for securing employment to the poor man?" This is reduced to a *formula;* and we call it so, because it is not yet proved to be a fact—namely, that "it is work put up for the lowest bidder." The example runs thus—"A contractor requires a workman, and three men offer themselves. To the first he says—'How much do you want?' 'Three francs—I have a wife and family.' Very well: and to the second he also says, 'What do you require?'

'Two francs and a half—I have a wife, but no children.' 'And you,' to the third—'Two francs', is his reply; for he has neither wife nor children, and *the bargain is struck!*"

Now, in the first place, we never heard nor read of such a thing as this being done in all our lives—we never understood that masters thus bargained with their workmen. There is a certain scale of wages for certain employments regulated as to their value, and not as proportioned to the several "hostages given to fortune" which a married man is responsible for. To our thinking, and as far as we know, the single man has as much as the married—the exceptions are as "a grain of corn in a bushel of chaff," and truly not worth the finding; for the single man prepares to be married; and if he, on receiving as much money as the married man, expends less, it is that he may lay by the surplus, in order to prepare him for that "honourable station" which God has ordained to almost every living man. What!—are the holy and sacred instincts of the affections to be annihilated by political economy? What!—are the laws of God, as bound up in our organic being, to be set at nought by certain treaties of labour entered into between the master and the workman? Why, if this be not practical atheism, we never beheld any thing more like to it: it is an insult to human nature—it is an insult to the Deity to imagine such a thing—it is to be more like "Marcus" than "Malthus."

But here, again, is pointed out to us "depression of wages," "factories stopped," and "men out of work." This is quite another thing—this is a human contingency that we may freely discuss—this is an evil that we can, or can *not*, remedy; but it is here also that the most bitter heart-burnings and quarrellings ensue between men who see too far and others who do not look closely enough into the matter, and truly we prefer the error of the former to that of the latter: for it *is* possible to check the transitions of that thought which grasps too much, but it is utterly impossible to make up for the deficiency of idea—the barrenness of mind which, confined within its own circle, sees not beyond the limits of its own comforts; and, professing to know little or nothing, "sees no necessity for these things," or as willing to believe that all this newspaper "talk" is a wilful exaggeration—is merely seeking a little startling notoriety. It is as bad in its way as the ignorance of the princess who, hearing of a famine among the peasantry, marvelled that "they did not in that case take to eating their brown bread if their white was gone."

The rich and the poor do not stand in the same relation to each other as they did a century ago; for the stream of agricul-

tural and manufacturing prosperity has now gone through the grade of operative, manufacturer, and capitalist, till it finds him, probably, in the peerage. Then, this peerage is not that of hereditary descent and noble blood: it is allied to the people, and the people have a claim upon him, be he who he may. Entailed property has hurt few, save its possessor; but he who carries with him to this lordly height the wealth of mines, factories, and railroads, knows well that, *if* it is at the expense of the labourer who has not had "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work," he has left an injustice behind him which it behoves him to remedy, and that right soon; and if it be the case—as we cannot but confess our fears for it—that between the appalling numbers who in all corners of this land raise their unemployed hands to heaven and cry for redress, and the other class, wealthy or aristocratic or both in one, there stands an old and aggravated feud, and if there should come a collision and a struggle for the mastery, the result will be fatal—but to whom? You cannot cannonade men who cry for work and bread—therefore this imminent matter must be looked to. Every moment is pregnant with some gathering cloud that threatens to discharge in terrific fire on our heads. We have had political revolutions enough, and may have more; but let us not have a revolution of starving millions who *will* work and *cannot* obtain it.

The doctrine of resignation to physical evils is one vainly preached to the rude and savage communities who dwell by thousands in the wild and lawless districts where labour continued and unceasing is the lot of the inhabitants, until some commotion in society puts a stop upon that labour, and turns them out in armed and ferocious groups to the demolition of property and the sacrifice of life. Men whose hearts are on fire with their wrongs, whose minds, not naturally sanguinary, but having known no touch of the generous sympathies of human hearts for them, are led to believe that society looks upon them as the "tillers of wood and the drawers of water" for ever—men, whose hereditary bondage comes with all the aggravation of contempt, oppression, and hunger—how can you by any words reduce these to order and docility? How can you hope by any remonstrances to soothe the irritated feelings of this savage, when the demagogue tells him that he is trampled and crushed to the ground by oligarchy or by aristocracy; and when he turns his eyes around him and looks upon his miserable home, the haggard children, and the foodless wife, he cries, "Behold, it *is* so!—then, verily, brothers, let us arm against this accursed tyranny which thus tramples us: let us attack these laws, which are made not in mercy but for judgment: let us show to these, our proud masters,

that we will not submit: for, rather than that, we will kill, burn, destroy—we will give our factories to the flames and inundate our coalpits." Alas! when such happens, it is not labour—"the check rein" of M. Guizot (as Louis Blanc observes)—that will serve your turn; nor with police or military can you intimidate these men, or cause their hands to drop the arms they have seized.

We extract further, and it is to this that we call the attention of the Legislature, because here are words which may be uttered by any or all men:—

"Competition is as fatal to the security of the rich as it is to the existence of the poor. Unceasingly oppressing the latter, it is perpetually menacing the former. Do you know from whence come the greatest part of the wretched beings who are candidates for the gaol? From every great seat of industry. The manufacturing departments furnish our courts of assize with *double* the number of charges that the agricultural departments do. The statistics of crime furnish unanswerable proofs of this. But what are we to think of the present organization of labour—of the conditions imposed upon it, and the laws which regulate it—if the galleys are recruited from the workshops? Of what weight are those alarming words of M. Moreau Christophe:—'At the point where we now are, the robbery of the rich by the poor is but an act of restitution—that is to say, a just and reciprocal change of a piece of money or a morsel of bread, which returns from the hands of the robber into the hands of him who has been robbed?'"

Alarming words enough, we add, these are; but we trust we can conscientiously, and not as the Pharisee either, thank God that these are spoken of France and not England; and yet we may beg the reader to look once more to the opening pages of this article. Our quotation goes on to say:—

"Rack your imagination after that, ye philanthropists, for some beautiful penitentiary system. As soon as you have given the criminal a little education, the misery which awaits him on his release from your prisons will thrust him back again into them without mercy. It is calculated that, in the penitentiary of New York, *of every two who are liberated one returns to it.* Enlightened physicians leave, I pray you, the infected creature in his hospital; for in restoring him to liberty you only expose him to infection again."

As a sad corollary to this fearful picture we may add that, in England, we have most urgent need of some legislative preparation for the young thief who leave the prisons, for in this case "a little learning is a dangerous thing:" it adds to the misery of his condition, inasmuch as his ideas being enlarged by tuition, and his comprehension of human happiness opened by instruction, the bereavement of this pariah becomes the more fearful,

because he judges by contrast. And the circle which men draw around him—avoiding him as a moral leper, so to speak—only increases to a savage intensity the violent reaction of evil within him, so that in this spirit of revenge he is infinitely worse than before:—

"And, then, what is the sanitary process in your prisons? *The contact of the incorrigible villain is mortal to him who is yet susceptible of being reclaimed*, for vice has some points of honour as well as virtue. Will you, then, have recourse to solitary imprisonment? How unfortunate has the experience of it proved! Of eleven individuals condemned to solitary imprisonment, in the state of Maine, five died, two destroyed themselves, and the faculties of the rest became deadened. See, then, the morality of solitary imprisonment when we interrogate statistics! But what good can it do to deny the efficacy of a remedy so ardently studied? Well, for an instant, let us hold it to be incontestable. The *régime*, then, of your prisons will answer better than that of your workshops. You offer, then, the robber a premium, society saying to a poor man, 'Attack me if you wish I should show the least solicitude for you.' That would appear like jesting—would it not? It is, nevertheless, the inevitable consequence of an industrial *régime*, in which every manufactory has become a school of corruption."

The next paragraph is one of terror and dismay: it tends to destruction of soul and body—loss here and loss hereafter. We will first of all quote from Louis Blanc and afterwards from an English author, and, by apposition, leave the reader to judge of the moral condition of the manufacturing poor:—

"There is another fatal consequence. I have said that from *individualism springs competition*, and from competition springs the uncertainty and insufficiency of wages, and this tends to the dissolution of family ties. Every marriage brings with it an increase of expenses; and why should poverty couple with poverty? *Here, then, you see marriage giving way to concubinage.* Children are born to the poor; but how are they to be supported? Hence the great number of unfortunate creatures found dead in the streets, and on the steps of our lonely churches, and even under the peristyle of the palace where the laws are made. And that no doubt may remain as to the cause of infanticide, statistics here again inform us that the number of infanticides in the fourteen departments which are most industrial are to those committed throughout the entire of France in the ratio of *forty-one to one hundred and twenty-one!*"

Now, from this appalling picture of industrial immorality in France turn to this picture of our condition at home. Speaking of the manufacturing poor, the writer goes on to say:—

"Vice and demoralization reign unchecked in these establishments. No rule is abolished by a few exceptions. We concede that such exist; but we challenge inspection of the mills and factories throughout

the land on this point. There *are* masters who take an interest in the well-being of their servants—who promote virtue and discountenance vice—who adopt a system of watchful surveillance either in their own persons or by agents preferred for their moral and spiritual qualifications—who repress obscene language, spread a shield over female modesty, and silence the voice of blasphemous guilt.....But what proportion do they bear to the bulk of their brethren? Is it as one to twenty? One to fifty? One to a hundred? We fear it is not.

"This, then, is the all-but-universal character of a factory: the labourers consist of persons of both sexes and of all ages—from the hoary transgressor, whose experience in the craft compensates in the employer's sight for the diminution of his bodily strength, and whose long experience in iniquity renders him no less effectual in Satan's device, down to the little child that cannot yet attach a meaning to the foul expressions which its ears drink in. These persons, contributing each some share to the common stock of evil communication—with feelings narrowed by perpetual imprisonment, soured by contrasting their own wretched lot with that of the classes for whom they toil, clouded by expulsion from all with which God has beautified the face of nature and gifted with powers at once to refresh, expand, soften, and brighten man's mind—irritated by the compulsory proximity of some who are feared, hated, envied, or despised—where evil passions like fire will rage more fiercely in proportion as they are pent in by a narrow boundary, and hardened by habitual striving against the dictates of natural conscience, and the little, the very little, they know of God's holy law—these people form the element in which they live—an ocean of reckless, raging, profligacy—are prepared to overpower and engulf every new victim cast upon the surface of its bottomless abyss. Among them marriages are formed despite the universal licentiousness that seems to set the sacred tie at defiance; and the young wife enters upon her domestic duties wholly unacquainted with, and unfitted for, their performance.

"Her morals *may* have escaped the practical pollution of the mass: her mind *cannot* have continued undefiled in the daily hearing and seeing of such abominations; and she becomes, if the injuries sustained by the crippling nature of her employment have not incapacitated her from child-bearing, the mother of infants whom she knows not how to train otherwise than upon factory principles.....The man meanwhile, finding no household fire rendered pleasant in its poverty by female neatness and good management, cheerfulness and love, *betakes himself to the beer-shop, or the Chartist meeting*, to be wrought up by fiery potations and fiery harangues to the pitch necessary for whatsoever evil work lies before him, whether it be in the dens of grovelling sensuality, or in scenes where the murderer whets his weapon and the incendiary trims his torch ..... It involves indirectly, but inevitably, a fearful amount of infanticide."

Here, again, is another phase of the present disorganization of labour. A letter from Yorkshire speaks thus;—

"Three years ago, at the opening of the morning, you might have

seen flocking into our town, from the hamlets adjacent, more than seven hundred men who were regularly employed in the factories of the place. You would now see them no longer; but, in their room, you would see seven hundred *women* leaving their husbands unemployed and their infants without female care, and all thronging in to do that very work which formerly gave occupation and a maintenance to their husbands."

Now, having read the foregoing and deeply pondered upon it, we are compelled to look upon it as nothing more nor less than a specimen of gigantic evil—the frightful nature, awful extent, and the appalling guilt of which is not equalled by anything in the universe. Here is the fertile source of all disorganization—here is the nursery of the assassin, of the burglar, of the thief—here is the prolific mother of crime!

As chapter after chapter of the work is dedicated to the consideration of his favourite theme, "Competition," we extract here and there as we advance, in order that our readers may have as fair an idea of his proposed system as can be given:—

"A *cheap market*, according to the economists of the school of Smith and Say, is the expressive phrase which comprehends all the advantages of unlimited competition. But why persist in estimating the results of a cheap market merely in relation to the benefits which the consumer derives from it? A cheap market benefits the consumer by inflicting anarchy and destruction upon the producer—a cheap market is the club with which the wealthy producer crushes the inferior producer—a cheap market is the secret instrument with which the adventurous speculator crushes the humble labourer: it is the sentence of death to the poor manufacturer, who has not the means to purchase extensive machinery—a privilege exclusively confined to his wealthier rival. It is the executioner of monopoly—the sucking-pump of humble industry, of humble commerce, and of restricted means—it is, in a word, the destruction of the small capitalist, to the profit of his greater opponent."

This we believe to be perfectly correct; for we hold that cheapness, merely and solely as such, has a tendency to make the article despicable, to lower the standard of the workman, to introduce a spurious and vile material into the market in place of the genuine and original article of sale, the former of which, in the end, concludes in fraud and dishonesty on the part of buyer and seller, and, finally, to the ruin of the manufacturer; for, if we do but look around us, this last year we see nothing but bankrupts filling our courts, trade suspended in all directions, the peaceful brows of commerce appalled and terrified; while the shopkeeper shrinks from the terrible pauperism which, thus contributing to *support*, only impoverishes him and does not lessen their number. But to proceed:—

"Capital and labour (the English say) are two powers which are naturally hostile to one another."

We may say here, by the bye, that we cannot but feel obliged to M. Louis Blanc for enlightening us on a point we were not before aware of; for we have held a different idea, which we do not acknowledge changed as yet, and believed that it was held in common with many practical men of the day. We say the fault lies in the *working*—in the application—in the conclusions; but "*chacun a son gout,*" as our neighbours say, and our friend of the *ouvriers* must be fairly heard :—

"How are you to compel them to live comfortably together, and mutually assist each other? This there is only one way of accomplishing. If the workman never wants work, or the master, on the other hand, easily finds a market for his products which will enable him to give proper wages to the workmen, is not the problem solved? When production becomes infinitely active and consumption infinitely elastic, which of them can then have the right or the temptation to complain? The wages of the one will always be sufficient, and the profit of the other always considerable. Open, then, to human activity the gates of infinity, and let nothing clog the impetuosity of its flight. Proclaim *Le Laissez Faire* boldly and without reserve. But is there not too little variety in the productions of England to secure a long career for its commerce?"

We were about to pause in our extract, and, by taking a glance mentally across the mighty grasp of industrial activity of England, to have answered this seemingly impertinent query —a query which at the first glance appears motiveless, were it not for the following exposition of English energy and English enterprise. In answer to the question, which implies that England may have too little variety in her productions, these words follow, as spoken by us :—

"We will make sailors and build ships, which shall place at our disposal the commerce of the world! We inhabit only an island—then we will board every continent on the globe. The number of raw materials with which our agriculture can supply us is too limited. Very well: then we will ransack the extremities of the earth to procure staples for our manufactures. England shall work for all mankind, and all mankind will consume the products of England. Produce, produce, and canvass the whole world for consumers: that shall be the object upon which England employs her whole strength —that will be the work which shall endow her with wealth, and develop the genius of her sons!"

"What a gigantic scheme!....."

Well: we admit it *is* gigantic, and we accept with some pride, too, this tribute paid to British perseverance—to that boldness

and commercial power which has earned us the proud title of "merchant princes," albeit M. Louis Blanc presents us with this compliment in a way meant to be cutting and with a subacity which the termination of his chapter accounts for, while it is conferred with a pride like that of the Cynic that he does not attempt to conceal. He evidently forgets that it is by these means the channels of industry have been thrown open to thousands—to millions; that, by "making seamen and building ships," the extremities of the earth were brought, together with their products, to our own doors. Decidedly we *want* to produce, and we also *want* consumers; and it is only to be lamented that the demand does not always go beyond the supply: but whose fault is that? Is it the fault of commerce? Is this the tendency of the spirit of trade? Is the merchant or the shopkeeper *desirous* of continuing in this state of social anarchy and threatened outrages? We opine not; and still point out to the free trade of Mr. Cobden as the cause, and to Lord John Russell's remarkable expression, in spite of the universal cry, "that there is, in his opinion, no reform of notorious and palpable evils required—that all seemed to him working well and in order," as a corollary; for, truly, this seems like giving a stone instead of bread.

What is to be seen? On the 10th of April (and we confess we cannot look upon this in the same light manner that many have done), we beheld the Chartists assembled in thousands on Kennington Common, while they had threatened to demolish London: we also beheld with what a willing and cheerful spirit, as one man, the traders, merchants, and housekeepers turned out to take the place of the police in the streets, in order to protect public peace until the mob was dispersed. This middle class repudiated Chartism on that day—they held themselves, in every sense of the word, apart from them; but when the feverish hour of anxiety and fear—fear for the misguided men upon whom the fire of one knows not how many muskets might fall—when this day was passed, we beheld the same class rising up and taking the place of the Chartists: they said to Government, as we have read on the very street walls, "These men have threatened us with plunder, and anarchy and ruin, and we have said—No, you shall not do that; we will still protect ourselves and others." But then they added also, "There must be something of right in the demands of these men—there is some foundation for the angry and threatening demonstration they have made. Instead of preparing your cannon and battalions, open your ears—look into their grievances: we are convinced that they are not *all* wrong; and we humbly petition

you—as we also behold some of the evils under which we suffer in common with them—to attend unto them and remedy the evil. We cannot perpetually act for *you*—we cannot neglect our own business and trade in order that *you* may neglect your duty. See ye, therefore, into the matter."

Now, when this strange transfer is made—when the "second estate" becomes the medium, or the intercessor between the *proletaries* of England and their lawgivers—there must be no lack of sympathy with their demand. It is not by the adoption of their Charter, however, or by seconding their "points," that the middle class movement acts. In this new Reform agitation, headed by Hume and aided by the suffrages of the most respectable men in the highest towns in the land, we witness the tendency of a new age breaking down the selfishness of trade, and beginning to fraternize with the operatives of all districts. They have taken a noble stand in the gap, and between the two contending parties they are arbitrating—like a "balance of power;" and, though they may be and are irritated against those leaders of the people who incite them to "private assassination," to fire-raising, and to wanton and secret outrages, still, that there is a necessity for a thorough examination into the whole organization of the industrial classes is admitted by the very agitation which now pervades them. We have now, then, the second and the third classes in motion. What will the *first* do?

M. Louis Blanc's "Organization du Travail" lacks neither fine, energy, nor eloquence. When he is bitter his sarcasm is fine: when he is impassioned his style is lofty and his language suitable to the theme; but, when he lays down a theory, he does it with so many sophistical delusions that they are discoverable far too soon. If, while we believe him to be in earnest and at heart thoroughly honest—if he sees in the course of his plan anything that may take the form of a fatal objection or stand in the way of his "generalizing"—he passes it by without notice or skilfully plasters the wound over; but, if you look for it, it is not so well done as to elude your search.

Next, again, follows a passage that is certainly very important to *us*:—

"While England exhausts itself in almost incredible efforts to render the whole universe tributary to its industry, what a spectacle does its internal history present to the attentive observer! Factories succeed to factories; the invention of to-day supersedes the invention of yesterday; the furnaces of the north ruin those of the west; *the working classes increase beyond all measure under the excitement of unlimited competition;* the number of cattle which supply food for

man lies far behind the number of horses which man must feed; *the bread of charity supplies the place of that of industry;* a poor law is introduced which stimulates poverty to multiply; and England, in short, presents to an astonished and indignant world a spectacle of extreme misery cowering under the wings of inordinate opulence. Such are the results of that politico-economical maxim, which is part and parcel of its national system. England must everywhere, and at any cost, look out for consumers!"

Now, here we are at issue with our theorist, but when he tells us that "the bread of charity supplies the place of that of industry," and points to our new "Poor Law" as a comment upon that sentence, we cannot deny his inference; but if he attribute present evils to unlimited competition, and declares that it is in consequence of "looking out, at any cost, for consumers," we confess that we are struck with the silliness of such an apothegm. What!—must not the trader canvass in order to sell his goods? Shall they rot and rust on his shelves or in his warehouse before he must be guilty of finding consumers? What else, then, can be meant?

The organization, as we take it, is to work in this manner. The Government is to be supposed as the supreme regulator of industry—to raise a great loan, which shall be devoted to the erection of great workshops for the most important branches of national industry—the number of ateliers to be rigorously circumscribed; "but, in virtue of their very organization, they will be endowed with an immense force of expansion."

The Government will frame their laws, and workmen who can give guarantees for morality will be employed. And now we come to that portion of the "Organization" where, at the very outset, signs of discontent visibly appear upon the distant horizon. When men, rejoicing at first in the benevolent scheme of ameliorating social miseries, see preparations made for giving a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, fraternization takes quite a beautiful aspect: it is present joy and ease of heart; but when the skilful artist finds himself beside the unskilful and the same rate of remuneration given to both—when the classification of industrial orders deprives the one of its dignity and the other of its greater profits—then comes in discontent, murmurings, complainings: in fact, the outer structure being finely "stuccoed with fine ideas" and "moral distiches" about the "sovereign people," and with maxims after Rochefocault, Rousseau, and M. Louis Blanc, does not for all that give stability to the structure—does not in anywise prevent the walls of the Utopian "atelier" from giving way—and, we fear, a worse anarchy than before would result from the failure of this fondly cherished scheme.

To continue: a scale of salaries will be graduated according to the "hierarchy of functions," which is a term we do not *quite* comprehend, and which may be our fault; but it means, if it means anything, that certain workmen will receive greater pay than others; but there is a main fact, and a good one, connected with this, that "the salary shall in all cases be amply sufficient for the support of the workman."

But M. Louis Blanc: if we go back a little, we shall find some terse remarks made regarding the married and the unmarried workmen. Are you going now, we ask, to destroy what you have already insisted upon? Is the amount of the workman's salary to be made in reference to those dependent upon him—or is it made without respect to married or single? If the former, the unmarried worker, who is as skilful and may be *more* skilful than the married one, beholds him (the married) obtaining *more* wages for the same work—a thing, according to the value of labour, palpably unjust; and, if not, then according to the moral right and the contract of the competitor, there is equal injustice existing. How are these to be reconciled?

"Every year an account shall be made up of the net profits, which shall be divided into three parts: one part shall be equally divided among the members of the association: another shall be destined—first, to the support of the aged, infirm, and sick; and, secondly, to the alleviation of the crisis which may fall on other branches of industry, every branch of industry owing mutual aid and succour to each other; and the remaining part shall be devoted to furnishing the instruments of labour to those who wish to join the association, in order that it may be able to extend itself indefinitely.

"Every member of the social atelier will have the right of laying out his salary as he pleases; but the evident economy and indisputable excellence of living in common will not be long in begetting, out of an association of labour, a voluntary association of wants and enjoyments.

"Capitalists will be invited to join the association, and will receive interest upon the capital invested by them, which interest will be guaranteed by the budget; but they will not participate in the profits, except they do so in the capacity of workmen."

M. Louis Blanc has, however, met some very severe and able opponents to his system, among whom we find the name, of M. Chevalier, who, after a passage of great eloquence, asks—

"What is the law by which payment is regulated in countries where labour is free? It is by the abundance of the capital compared with the workmen who require employment. The eternal law of the relation between supply and demand is here in operation, and serves as a rule for all transactions. A manufacturer has only capital enough to employ a hundred workmen, paying them four francs a-head: two

hundred present themselves: if he must employ them all, he can only give them two francs—that is certain. Thus, the more the population multiplies relatively to the capital, the more will wages decrease: they will fall to the detriment of the public welfare in spite of the appeals of Christian charity—the cry of wounded humanity: they will fall until the unfortunate workmen are reduced to the *minimum* of subsistence—to the grossest food. Such is the history of Ireland, where, in proportion as population has increased whilst capital was stationary, the unhappy peasants have come down from the consumption of meat to dry bread—from dry bread to potatoes of good quality—from the mealy potato to the watery and hard potato."

We believe, however, that three remarks may be made, even with this portion of M. Chevalier's eloquent reply, to M. Louis Blanc's "Organisation"—first, that he begs the question regarding the manufacturers; for it is hardly possible that any one man ever did or would begin business under the precise circumstance of a certain sum, more or less, which a certain number of workmen would in one week absorb; secondly, an increase of population has always increased the demand to some extent or other; and, thirdly, we can scarcely recognise the physical condition of Ireland to have resulted from the state of her manufactures, as it does not appear that the manufactures of that country have ever been vast or extensive enough to become of such political consequence.

Once more, we say that neither we nor any other will or can deny that the evil existing in the social order is great and imminent—that the evil is spreading from them to us. It is not because we are apprehensive of injury that we cry out: we do not notice that, in the far circumference of the human crowd that circles us, some are hurt, crushed—morally or spiritually—*because* at the moment it does not touch ourselves; nor *because* we see that the influence on the outer communicates to the inner, and finally to us. God forbid that such a selfish sentiment should influence our thoughts or guide our pen! We trust we have the good of humanity and the well-being of society too much at heart: we hope we are looking over this solemn business with more serious eyes: we hope we are in some little degree doing part of the duty devolving upon us, in not letting a question, the vitality and importance of which cannot be exceeded by any private or public interest, pass us by. Our journals are daily chronicles of misery: our workhouses are in part the evidences of the almost hopeless condition of things under the present system: there *must* be a change: *let it not, then, be done by the hands of the people;* but let the rulers of the land not blindly turn from the threatening clouds and the distant growling of the thunder: the storm *will* come: look ye,

either southward or westward, for the fairer weather. Look at the influx of pauperized Irishmen into Liverpool of late: look at the influx of poor into Cheltenham of late: look at the continual addition in numbers and the additional parish rates, in many parts increased both ways, within this last season. We do not look to over-population, nor do we say that the poor man finds the soil everywhere pre-occupied: it is so, but not in the exclusive sense: he has a share of its labour and its produce; or, if it be really that the evil of over-population is the cause of all other evils, turn your eyes, then, to the emigration movement; and, if you can find comfort in that, do so. Lessen the pressure of the population, and it will be the same again in the course of twenty years; and even increased, if the political economists be right, in a terrible geometric ratio; but we hold that the labour question claims the pre-eminence—think of that *well* over first: it becomes all men to look for remedies when the disease is affecting others only; for, if the sense of self-preservation alone act upon us so long as the labouring class receive the consideration which is really due to them, we will not be over-curious in examining the motives which actuate them—we ought not: let us receive whatever good there is done thankfully.

Let us see what Thomas Carlyle says with regard to Ireland, which, with a population *all* poor and threatening us with civil war, imperatively demands our attention. He writes:—

"Remedial measures are very needful for Ireland's sake, and, indeed, for Britain's, which is indissolubly chained to her, and is drifting along with her and by reason of her, close in the rear of her, towards unspeakable destinies otherwise. *Our copartnery being indissoluble, it is to ourselves also of the last importance that the depths of Irish wretchedness be actually sounded*—that we get to the real bottom of that unspeakable cloaca, and endeavour, by heaven's blessing, with all the strength that is in us, to commence operations upon it. Purified that hideous mass must be, or we ourselves cannot live! More stringent than O'Connell eloquence, or O'Brien pike-manufacture, the law of nature itself makes us now, in every fibre, participant of Ireland's wretchedness. Steam passage from Ireland to Liverpool is occasionally as low as fourpence a-head. Not a wandering Irish lackall that comes over to us, to parade his rags and hunger, and sin and misery, but comes in all senses as an irrepressible missionary of the like to our own people—an inarticulate prophet of God's justice to nations—heralding to us also a doom like his own. Of our miseries and fearful entanglements here in Britain, he, the Irish lackall, is by far the heaviest; and we cannot shake him off."

And, again, he says:—

"The mad cry of repeal you can put down—change into another

as mad, or less, or still more mad—but him you cannot put down. For Britain's sake itself, if Britain is to continue habitable much longer, Ireland must actually attain remedial measures—and of a kind we have not been much used to, for two centuries back, in this country. We have been a little idle, in respect of Irish remedial measures, for two centuries back! In fact, ever since Oliver Cromwell's time, we have done little but grimace and make-believe, and *sham* a kind of governing there; attaching ourselves to any entity or sham that would help us along from year to year; imagining (miserable criminals that we have been!) that falsities and injustices, well varnished, would do instead of facts and continuous performance according to the eternal laws—as if not a God had made Ireland and us, but a devil, who could quote Scripture on occasion! And now it has all come down upon us; and we welter among it, on the edge of huge perils: and we must alter it or prepare to perish. Surely, if ever for any country in the world, remedial measures are needed for Ireland now!"

Of the truth of this latter assertion there cannot be a moment's doubt: there can be no hesitation in admitting that "something must be done," or they will find that "something" for themselves: we *cannot*, we must *not*, exterminate them.

We conclude our paper by giving the speech which Prince Albert delivered at a late public meeting on behalf of the industrial poor—a speech which shows him to have a thorough English heart, and which will make him beloved of thousands for many a year to come. His Royal Highness said:—

"Ladies and Gentlemen: when, four years since, this Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Labouring Classes was first established on its present footing, I accepted with pleasure the offer made to me of becoming its president. I saw in this offer a proof of your appreciation of *my feelings of sympathy and interest for that class of our community which has most of the toil and least of the enjoyments of this world.* I conceived that great advantage would accrue from the endeavours of influential persons, who were wholly disinterested, to act the part of the friend of those who required advice and assistance, which only a friend could tender with advantage. The society has always held this object before its eyes, and has ever been labouring in that direction. You are all aware that it has established model lodging-houses, loan funds, and the system of allotments of ground in different parts of the country; *but it has been careful only to establish examples and models, mindful that any real improvement which is to take place must be the result of the exertions of the working people themselves.* I have just come from the model lodging-house, the opening of which we celebrate this day; and I feel convinced that its existence will, by degrees, cause a complete change in the domestic comforts of the labouring classes, as it will exhibit to them that with real economy can be combined advantages with which few of them have hitherto been acquainted; whilst, on the other hand, it will show to those who possess capital that they

may invest it with great benefit and profit to themselves, at the same time that they dispense those comforts to which I have alluded to their poorer brethren. *Depend upon it that the interest of often-contesting classes are identical,* and that it is only ignorance which prevents their uniting to each other's advantage. To dispel that ignorance, and to show the means by which man can help man, notwithstanding the complicated state of civilized society, ought to be the aim of every philanthropic person; *but it is more peculiarly the duty of those who, under the blessing of Divine Providence, enjoy high station, wealth, and education.* Let them be careful, however, to avoid any dictatorial interference with labour and employment, which frightens away capital, destroys that freedom of thought and independence of action which must remain to every one if he is to work out his own happiness, and impairs that confidence under which alone engagements for mutual benefit are possible. God has created man imperfect, and has left him with many wants, as it were to stimulate each to individual exertion, and to make all feel that it is only by united exertions and combined actions that those imperfections can be corrected and those wants satisfied. This presupposes self-reliance and confidence in one another. It is to show the way in which those individual exertions can be directed with the greatest benefit, and to foster that confidence upon which your readiness to assist each other depends, that this society considers its most sacred aim. The next step which we contemplate taking is the erection of a model lodging-house for families; and I hope the meeting will enable us to carry out that step, and that the attention of the public will be more generally engaged to the objects which we have in view."

ART. VII.—*Egypt's Place in Universal History: an Historical Investigation in Five Books.* By CHRISTIAN C. J. BUNSEN, D.P. and D.C.L., Translated by CHARLES N. COTTRELL, Esq. Vol. I. Longmans. 1848.

THIS work will be regarded under two aspects—the one having reference to the materials for historic investigation which are here brought together—the other concerning the opinions which are advanced as derivable from the investigation of these records of ancient facts. In the first point of view, we apprehend that all competent judges will be of one mind in praise of the diligence and skill which are manifested by the author, who seems to have watched with interest the progress of hieroglyphical interpretation, from the time when a clue was first afforded by decyphering the Egyptian names of Ptolemy and Berenice on the Rosetta stone; and who has enjoyed the advantage of personal acquaintance with all the eminent men by whom that

clue was followed out and the discovery perfected; so as to have achieved by their combined industry and talents this the greatest of historical triumphs reserved for modern times; and putting us in possession of the means for understanding and interpreting monuments at once the most astonishing, as belonging to the earliest periods in the history of the presently existing races of mankind; and also the most instructive, as found in a land which was first among the nations of antiquity in the career of civilization, and long held the foremost place in arts and in arms: so as to have been the country from whence Greece avowedly derived the elements of those sciences which we have inherited from her, and which are the especial boast of modern times, and dignify and adorn the enlightened nations of western Europe.

In preparing the Egyptian vocabulary, and the types necessary for representing the hieroglyphical signs contained in this volume, the author has judiciously availed himself of the practical knowledge and the artistic skill of Messrs. Birch and Bonomi, who are already known to the public by several works on Egyptian mythology, the produce of their combined talents. Many of the examples are to be found in the British Museum, and in that department of which Mr. Birch has the superintendance: they may, therefore, be verified by all who desire to ascertain the facts for themselves. And with the same laudable intent of inducing the reader to examine for himself, and rest his opinion on sure grounds, the most important of the fragments which remain of Manetho, Eratosthenes, and Berosus, are given in an appendix, which occupies nearly a third of the volume. Extracts also are given from Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, and Josephus, bearing on the history of Egypt, and on the chronology and modes of writing among the Egyptians; so as to put us in possession of all the information necessary for coming to a right conclusion on the questions discussed in the work. Thus we have presented to us the fullest and the most exact work that has hitherto appeared on the interpretation of hieroglyphical inscriptions. Indeed, it is the only English publication which is at the same time full enough to be useful, and moderate enough in price to be within the reach of all. We have no doubt that it will be accepted as a valuable boon by the British public; and we should observe that, although it was first written in German, it is so admirably translated that the style has all the ease and freedom of an original composition. Nor should we have known otherwise, than by the title-page and preface, that it had been prepared in any other than the language in which it appears.

The opinions advanced in the course of the work become a question quite distinct from that of the value of the materials for investigation which are thus brought together. Men might be unanimous in their commendations of the diligence and fidelity manifested in the collection of this dictionary or store-house of knowledge; and might still find room for diversity of judgment respecting the use which has been made of these various historical facts bearing upon the earliest and darkest periods in the history of mankind. For these discoveries, astonishing as they are, have not advanced us much nearer to certainty than before in determining the great epochs of Egyptian chronology, or establishing a connection between Egyptian history and that of the other great nations of the old world. We ourselves are not able to determine with certainty the year in which our Lord was born, or the exact commencement of the Christian era: other more remote epochs are involved in a still greater obscurity in proportion to the distance of time. In such cases there is room for diversity of opinion, which each man should feel himself at perfect liberty to express, while he allows the same liberty to others; and he will not only tolerate, but weigh with candour and impartiality, the arguments of others, although they should run counter to his preconceived opinions on the subject.

In approaching the history of any ancient people, as found recorded among themselves, we must remember that all these records necessarily fall very far short of the rise of that nation, and of the time when its history actually began. It is only after the barbarous time is past, and when a people has gained a settled place in the world, and leisure to cultivate the arts of peace, that it begins to record its history; and this is pre-eminently the case with Egypt and the monuments of its power and early history. The palaces and temples which remain are splendid monuments of both, even in their ruins; and, being the only records, they carry us no higher than the time when Egypt was able to erect palaces and temples, and was, therefore, great and powerful; and, being secured from foreign aggression, could direct its attention to internal embellishments, and that on a scale which indicates prodigious wealth and long association with grandeur.

Could we really discover the first beginnings of things, they would not be very unlike the history of Romulus, with his band of wanderers, getting possession of a hyde of land, and building a wall over which an active man might leap. But none of these humble beginnings will appear on the palaces and temples of a mighty empire. On the contrary, as the builder of these trophies of grandeur calls himself son of the sun and lord of the

world, so, whenever the early history of the nation is mentioned, some demigod will be introduced, and the whole become so involved in the mists of a fabulous mythology as to render the simple truth wholly undiscoverable in these pompous legends. And the case is not improved by having recourse to other channels of information, such as the priests could furnish, or such as may be found floating in the form of traditions among the people. These, in fact, stand on precisely the same footing as the inscriptions, and receive from time to time a fresh colouring from the altered condition of the people. The same demigods and heroes make up the tale, and figure on the monumental sculptures.

Manetho commences his enumeration of Egyptian kings with a dynasty of demigods amounting to sixteen; the first of whom he calls Hephaistos, the last, Zeus: and after these departed demigods he brings in the kings; Menes being the first, who is universally acknowledged to have been the founder of the Egyptian monarchy, and is generally regarded as the same person who is called Mizraim, the son of Ham, in Scripture—Egypt itself being called after him Mizraim in Hebrew, and being called Chem or Cham in Greek, after his father Ham, who is also supposed to be designated in one of the demigods, Ammon. Eratosthenes commences his list of Theban kings with Menes the Thebnite, or Thinite, as Manetho calls him: both titles proving that he came from another place, and was truly the founder of the monarchy. But he is called by Eratosthenes, Dionios, or son of Jupiter—showing that all before him is mythological and not historical. Syncellus begins his canon with "Mestraim, who is Menes," and calls him "the first native king of Egypt." Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the priests, says: "Some of them fable that the gods and heroes first reigned in Egypt during a period little less than eighteen thousand years; and that the last of the gods who reigned was Horus, the son of Isis. They also relate that the kingdom was governed by men during a series of nearly fifteen thousand years, to the hundred and eightieth olympiad in which we have visited Egypt, which was during the reign of Ptolemy, who bears the title of the younger Dionysus:" and he says that, "after the gods, Menes was the first king of the Egyptians." Herodotus was informed that Menes was the first king of Egpyt. "After him, the priests read out of a book the names of three hundred and thirty kings, and among these were eighteen Ethiopians and one woman, a native Egyptian: all the rest were men and Egyptians; and the name of the woman who reigned also over the country of Babylonia was Nitocris. Of the other kings, nothing remark-

able is in any way recorded, except the last, Mœris—he dug the lake." When we find a mere list of names like this, with no remarkable facts recited, we may rest assured that, as a record, it is of late origin. The names are not mentioned until something memorable has been done, when forthwith a dignified line of progenitors must be found or feigned. Herodotus himself speaks in a manner implying a very reasonable doubt of the truth of what he heard: he only affirms that he was told all this:—"From the first king to Sethos, the priest of Hephaistos (the contemporary of Senacherib), are three hundred and forty-one generations of men; and, in all these eleven thousand three hundred and forty years, *they say* no god has made his appearance in the human form; and during this time, *they say* that the sun has twice risen in parts different from what is his customary place—that is to say, has twice risen where he now sets, and has also twice set where he now rises."

If the sun had really twice changed his course, such startling facts would surely have been pointedly referred to in naming the kings during whose reigns these transitions occurred; but nothing of the kind is mentioned. The modern astronomer very well knows that such changes are in the nature of things impossible; they could not occur under present circumstances, and, if they did occur, would occasion the utter destruction of every living thing, not only in Egypt, but throughout the world, by altering the relationship of land and water, heat and cold, and all the elements. Herodotus could scarcely believe what he wrote. And though we shall have to suggest an explanation of what he heard, which may acquit the priests of the crime of intentional deception, it will leave the testimony of Herodotus in no better condition than before; for, if he has misunderstood the priests in astronomical points, he may have misunderstood them in the historical. We give him all credit for fidelity, and believe that he had no wish to mislead. But we agree with our author where he says:—

"It is impossible that Grecian men of letters, some of them of the school of Aristotle, critics and commentators whose ingenuity has never been surpassed, could be deceived or satisfied with the Egyptian method of computation. But did they institute researches into the old Egyptian chronology, and are their labours preserved to us? On the latter point, at least, considerable doubts may be entertained; for not only did Diodorus learn little or nothing from them, but modern investigators, far superior to the uncritical Sicilian, seem to have been so certain of not finding anything there that they have never even sought for it." (89).

And we agree in another discouraging fact that—

"As the Egyptians possessed no work on history among their sacred books, so neither had they any connected chronology like that of the years of Nabonassar, the Olympiads, or the building of Rome, and for the same reason. The nation sought and found here also a religious frame in which to express the continuity of its historical existence: this was the divine year, a cycle of 1461 natural years, by which the entire arrangement of the year of the priests and the cycle of the sacred festivals was regulated: it was more important to them to know in what year of the celestial cycle they lived than in what year of the empire of Menes.....This cyclic notation was made exclusively by the priests for the temple, and was kept a profound secret. The ordinary annual calendar gave the year of the reigning sovereign; but the temple calendar, regulated by the Sothiac cycle, may also be presumed to have combined with its astronomical dates some similar register of civil events. The historical lists of kings must, therefore, have been compiled by learned priests from the sacred registers, or have been tested and corrected by them. The institution of the priests stifled history just as the celestial cycle of years stifled their terrestrial computation; both, however, were favourable to chronology and the maintenance of annual registry" (24).

There is also an important element to be borne in mind by all who would attain a clear view of Egyptian history, or adjust in a satisfactory manner the order of the Pharaohs or the length of time belonging to each several dynasty and to all the dynasties in succession—namely, the indisputable fact that the whole of Egypt was not always under one ruler; for Upper and Lower Egypt were often divided, and we find one Pharaoh at Memphis, another at Thebes. In addition, to which we have strong grounds for believing that the more illustrious of the monarchs of Egypt, to give the greater splendour to their line of ancestry, have dignified with the style of Pharaohs many of their remote predecessors, whose actual occupation of the throne of Egypt is rendered exceeding improbable by the very distant period to which it would become necessary to throw it back; and for which royal dignity we have no other vouchers than these signets of their remote descendants:—

"One circumstance (says our author) deserves more particular mention in this place. We may venture to assume, from the investigation of the monuments of the old empire, that in it joint reigns occur, and especially in the twelfth dynasty, one of those preserved in the papyrus; but neither here or elsewhere in this record are several kings specified as reigning contemporaneously. Such co-regents, consequently, may be assumed to have been entirely omitted, perhaps with the exception of the elder one, or the one whose reign was of longest duration; or their names, where at least of the same family, may have been all introduced in the usual dynastic succession, one after the other. If the latter hypothesis were preferred we should have, in this most record of Egyptian chronology, a method directly opposed to

the system of a chronological canon. We may call it the 'dynastic,' its aim being to register every sovereign whether contemporaneous or successive. In this case, as many years of reign will have been assigned to each of the co-regents as he really had a share in the government. Admitting this to be correct, the sum total of the reigns recorded in such or such a dynasty will still be considerably greater than the duration of the dynasty—that is, than the time intervening between the beginning of the first and the end of the last reign" (56).

Hence it becomes evident that the exact determination of the chronology of Egypt is, as far as we at present know, an impossibility: we have no fixed starting point of time to begin with, and we have no determinate or invariable succession of reigns or dynasties to carry on and complete our calculations either upwards or downwards. We know not the time when Menes, or the builders of the pyramids, or the founders of the several dynasties, lived; or how many years elapsed between their ages and that of Alexander; and we know not how many of the Pharaohs reigned in succession, or how many were co-regents, and therefore cannot calculate the time backwards from the age of Alexander by adding together the years of their several reigns. Our determinations, therefore, cannot be relied on as exact—they are only approximations; and they are obtained by endeavouring to ascertain from the monuments a real succession of Pharaohs, retaining only one of those who reigned conjointly and excluding the others, by linking as many of the names as we can in this list with names of men whose place is known in the Jewish or Grecian history, and by filling up the intervals by means of the number of years which each king is traditionally reported to have sat upon the throne.

The monuments from which our list has to be collected are of three kinds—*national*, such as most of the obelisks and many other sculptured remains, like the Sphinx and the Memnon; *royal*, such as the palaces, commemorating the triumphs of the king; and *funereal*, such as the tombs of the kings which also receive illustration from the sculptures in the temples, and reflect light upon them in return, as is the case also in the other two classes of monuments; for the mythology of Egypt, of which the temples are the chief storehouses, pervaded everything else, and none of the monumental remains can be rendered intelligible without taking the element of superstition into our account. The obelisks are raised in the name of the king to the tutelary or national god of the age or dynasty: the royal victories are ascribed to the god then worshipped, and the spoils are presented to him; and the deceased monarch is represented as appearing before the god of hades to give an

account of his acts, or as himself being received into the catalogue of those benefactors of their country who were acknowledged as demigods by the popular superstition. The obelisks are valuable as indicating the father and generally the remote ancestor of the king in whose honour they were raised, headed by the patron god of the dynasty. The royal personage introduced into the second class of monuments is generally making offerings to his royal predecessors, which are often ranged in chronological order, and sometimes in uninterrupted succession, up to the foundation of the dynasty or even of the Egyptian monarchy; and sometimes with considerable omissions between the first and last names where the space was limited. The signets found in the tombs are generally the family ancestors of the king, and are therefore not always Pharaohs. But these furnish valuable information on the order of succession.

Our own history may afford an illustration of the state of things, on the supposition that we possessed such monuments of past times, and had no other means of discovering the connection and the order of past events. Thus we might find some monuments bearing the names of Saxon kings during the Heptarchy, which, in the absence of historical information, we might arrange in consecutive order, although we now know that they were contemporaries. And so also on monuments of the house of Tudor—we might find them passing over the Plantaganet and Norman lines, and tracing their ancestry to the petty princes of a principality which had long ceased to exist as a separate state; while the Stuarts would trace theirs to Scotland, and our present line of kings deduce theirs from Hanover.

The tablet of Rameses the Great, discovered by Mr. Bankes, at Abydos, and now deposited in the British Museum, is universally acknowledged to be the only sure basis, that we are as yet acquainted with, on which to attempt a restoration of the eighteenth and nineteenth of the Egyptian dynasties of Manetho, by the reconstruction of which we may approximately arrange the preceding series of Pharaohs, and by connecting the names of which with Jewish and Grecian history we may give to this line of kings a place not very remote from the true place of each in the stream of time. The line of hieroglyphics over the rings of the tablet has been read—"A libation to the Lords of the West, by the offerings of their son, the King Rameses, in his abode." This was the second Pharaoh of that name, and the third monarch of the nineteenth dynasty—one of the most distinguished among them, as the multitude of magnificent structures bearing his signet still attest. The tablet, as its inscription would lead us to infer, contained originally the signets of all those who

were acknowledged by Rameses as having held sovereign sway in Egypt; and of the immediate predecessors of Rameses we learn, from other monuments, that they are here arranged in regular chronological order, and we are therefore warranted in assuming that a chronological order was intended to be preserved throughout.

Moreover, Rameses himself was the contemporary of Solomon, for his successor was Sheshonk, or Sesac, who took Jerusalem in the time of Rehoboam; and the last of the eighteenth dynasty, and therefore the fourth predecessor of Rameses in this tablet, is Amenoph III., who was the Memnon of the Greeks, and is introduced by Homer as one of his heroes, and whose musical statue did more towards perpetuating his name in history and rendering his place important in the series than any of the exploits of his life. At the head of the eighteenth dynasty, seven generations higher than Memnon, and the twelfth of the predecessors of Rameses in this tablet, stands Amos, whom our author, following the great majority of those who have any right to be heard on such subjects, regards as the Pharaoh of the time of Moses, or his immediate successor. We adopt the latter opinion, believing that the seventeenth dynasty terminated in the Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea, and that his successor began the eighteenth.

If we assume Usher's chronology to be correct, these twelve generations cover a period of four hundred and eighty years, which gives an average of forty years to each reign, and cannot be very far from the truth. The sum of the several reigns, as given by Manetho, is four hundred and sixty-nine years, though he reckons fourteen kings instead of nine in the eighteenth dynasty. And it is worthy of remark that, though Manetho truly identifies Amenoph III. with the Memnon of the vocal stone, he places the Exode two generations later than the reign of Amenoph III., and the Trojan war ten generations later still, or twelve generations below Amenoph, both of which positions are manifestly false, and tend to shake our confidence in the assertions of Manetho.

This tablet of Rameses, however, carries us, in its *undefaced* part, five generations higher than Amos, the contemporary of Moses, to a Pharaoh who stands next but one to the first Osortasen in a tablet at Karnak, to which we shall next direct our attention, only premising that there were originally eight more names of kings preceding in time those which we have hitherto spoken of, which eight names have been *defaced*—that these, in all probability, were intended to carry up the line to the reputed origin of the monarchy, which eight names are filled up precisely by the tablet of Karnak, erected by Thothmos III.

Thothmos III., the builder of the palace at Karnak, lived seven generations earlier than Rameses, and four generations later than Amos, the contemporary of Moses. The monument of the Pharaohs at Karnak was discovered on the walls of a chamber, which it entirely covers. The rings of the Pharaohs therefore do not form one unmistakable series, like the single line on the tablet of Abydos; and, besides their being thus broken by occupying different sides of the wall, they are still more perplexingly separated by consisting of two lines instead of one, ranged one above the other, with no obvious evidence in the sculpture itself as to which of the lines is to be taken first, the upper or the lower; or at which end, either to the right or to the left of the entrance, we ought to begin. The sculptures, considered as a whole, are divided into two parts by a perpendicular line down the middle of the wall opposite the door of entrance; and, as the king stands on each side of the door making his offerings, that middle line at the greatest distance from the offerer may be regarded as the post of honour, and the place where we may look for the founder either of the dynasty or the monarchy as the case may be. We believe that in the present instance it was intended to record the name of both, placing that of the founder of the monarchy at the head of the *lowermost line* as the most honourable place of all—placing that of the founder of the monarch's family at the head of the *second line* as the next honourable place; so as that the two lines would *coincide* at the end where the offerer stands, and form one chronological series to be read in the boustrephodon order, beginning with the founder of the monarchy in the lower line, and coming down to the signet of Osortasen, which is the last of that line; and then taking up the signet which stands over it in the second line, and tracing the successors of Osortasen in the second line by returning in a backward order till we find, in the place of honour over the founder of the monarchy, one who was contemporary of Amos, and who derived his origin from the same stock with Amos, and to whom Thothmos III. meant to trace his ancestry and his right to the crown of Egypt. The evidence for this appears to us strong and remarkable, resulting from a careful comparison of the sculptures of this chamber of kings with the tablet of Abydos.

We have already stated that the Abydos tablet carries the line of Pharaohs five generations higher than the time of Amos. Now, the signet of Amos does not appear on the Karnak walls, but, in its place, Danteb or Nentef, and that without the solar [illegible], which is the usual sign of royalty: we say in the place of Amos, for it is followed to the left by five signets, which are

precisely similar to those of the predecessors of Amos on the tablet of Abydos, and only placed in an ascending order from right to left, instead of from left to right, but the succession is the same: and the remaining signet of this second line, together with the lower line of signets, would exactly fill up the spaces which are lost from the tablet of Abydos, and lead to the conjecture that they are here supplied; which conjecture is reduced almost to a certainty by finding the well-known signet of Osortasen to be the first to the left on the lower line, and by finding the last signet of the second line placed between that of Osortasen and the fifth predecessor of Amos in a tomb at Benihassan, examined by Major Felix.

The sculptures of Karnak consist of four lines of rings; but we regard the two upper lines as indicating men of inferior rank, notwithstanding their deification—that is, they are not classed in the Pharaoh line, or regarded as legitimate possessors of the crown. It is worthy of remark that the Nentef, to whom Thothmos offers as his ancestor, is not only without the solar disk in the line of kings, but he appears again as last of one of the upper lines, as if this were Nentef's line of ancestry; and we find among them both Pepi and Mer, en, ra, whom we know, from other sources, to have been early conquerors, but not Pharaohs—before the time of Osortasen and contemporary with the builders of the Pyramids: and we state this in order to discard not only Nentef, who could not possibly be a Pharaoh, because he is put into the place of Amos—a place which is, beyond contradiction, barred against him—but to exclude the whole class to which he belongs, and to exclude the upper line of the tablet of Abydos, as well as these upper lines of the chamber of kings, although some of the rings have the solar disk; for, although where the disk is wanting, we may be sure that it is not a Pharaoh, we cannot always be sure that where the disk is present the person signified was the legitimate sovereign. Usurpers, and even adventurers, sometimes assumed it; and we have many instances in the sculptures of one name being erased to substitute another in its place. We require distinct proof of the fact, and not an inference drawn from the solar disc, before we can admit that a fresh-discovered signet belonged to a Pharaoh: and we require it to be proved that such an one was not in whole or in part the contemporary of some other Pharaoh before we can admit the plea of finding room for another ruler to be a just ground for extending our received chronology.

What we have written has been with the intention of showing that we believe it practicable as well as desirable so to arrange

the chronology of Egypt as not to disturb the received opinions, resting upon Usher's arrangement of scriptural chronology, as deduced from the text of the Hebrew Bible. It is a subject to which we have devoted our best attention, and in reference to which we have examined, with all the care and diligence in our power, the difficulties which have been propounded by those who have made the antiquities of India or of Egypt their peculiar study; and we have found that these difficulties are not worthy of any sort of comparison with the objections which at once arise on the adoption of any other hypothesis, and which, after all, would be only an hypothesis resting on no solid foundation; besides, no such hypothesis stands or falls alone—other facts of the greatest importance are connected with it: some of these our author intimates in the introduction, saying—

"If, after having ascertained the date of the foundation of the Egyptian empire, we enquire whether it tallies with Scripture tradition as to the creation of mankind, and whether it corroborates the chronological systems based upon it—what bearing it has upon the assumptions of the Greek and Latin Churches—or (if we agree, not to dispute about a few thousand years, where objects so infinitely higher are concerned), how the result of our computations affects the question of creation—must we blink the point altogether instead of answering it? Again: we enquire whether the study of Egyptian history would lead us to the conclusion that there was one universal or several partial and local floods; and whether the most ancient traditions, those of Egypt especially, exhibit any indications of violent interruptions in the early stages of human advancement; and, lastly, what light is thrown, by our researches, on the great question of the unity of the human race and its primordial epochs" (xxxviii).

Now, we on our part assert that the Chevalier Bunsen does not at all know what dangerous ground he is venturing upon here. We are well contented that he should make the most that he can of Egyptian antiquities, and will give him a patient hearing and discuss them on their own merits; but we will not allow enquiries and discoveries which are only of yesterday, the truth of which are confessedly *sub judice*, and the results of which may turn out the very reverse of that which men confidently expect, to interfere with our settled convictions: we will not allow the foundations of our faith to be shaken by mere antiquarian research. To meet such antiquarians on their own ground, we have only to remember that Moses, at whatever time he lived, was certainly better versed in Egyptian history, as living in the court of Pharaoh, and learned in all the learning of the Egyptians, than Manetho or any of the other autho-

rities upon which so much reliance is placed: and the children of Israel, for whom he wrote, could not but be well acquainted with both the state of Egypt and with the time of their sojourning there; and their knowledge of the facts is a guarantee for the veracity of Moses in addition to his own personal character. Besides, the whole narrative has so much fulness and such straitforward simplicity that we rise from its perusal with a full conviction of its truth; and we feel confident that "the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years"—that is, from the time when Abram first went down into Egypt, as Usher explains it, and supported as it is by tradition and by the words of Stephen in the Acts.

In the last century, the superior antiquity of China and India was often urged as an objection to the Mosaic history. The claims of China were disposed of by proving that the astronomical data were derived from the Jesuits, and the history was found to be a fabrication: and the Indian pretensions have been set at rest by Prinsep and others, who have shown that authentic history cannot ascend higher in India than the age of Alexander the Great. When the Zodiacs of Denderah were brought to light in the beginning of the present century, Bailly and the French astronomers affected to find in them evidence of antiquity which incontestably proved that they had been made before the time which Moses assigns for the Deluge: a few years rendered it certain that they were constructed in the time of the Cæsars, and so we rest assured that it will be now with decyphering the hieroglyphics: some element will appear which has been overlooked, or some new element will be discovered, by means of which seeming contradictions will be reconciled, and the Scriptures, according to the literal Hebrew, will stand out in unimpaired integrity.

Chevalier Bunsen remarks that, although the Egyptians stand forth pre-eminently a people of reminiscences and of monuments, we find among their books nothing historical:—

"That these sacred books did not contain any history of the Egyptian nation is no less certain than that the Old Testament does contain that of the Jews. The idea of a people did not exist (among the Egyptians)—still less that of a people of God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth. History was born in that night when Moses, with the law of God, moral and spiritual, in his heart, led the people of Israel out of Egypt. .... On the extinction of the united kingdom of the twelve tribes, the popular mind became directed more to religious subjects; and thus the true historical style could never attain its complete cultivation among this people; but, in the same period, the muse of history found her favourite nation in the Greeks, and raised

up in Herodotus the master of research—the originator of the strictly historical connected narrative of the immediate past" (23).

We cite this passage merely for the fact that there are no discoverable traces of history, properly so called, among the writings of the Egyptians, or any ancient people save the Hebrews; and that it is only by connecting the Greek historians with the scriptural narrative that any reasonable hope can be entertained of combining the series and succession of events, so as to conceive of the several steps and stages by which mankind attained the position or sunk to the degradation in which we may severally find the different nations of the earth at the present day. Accounting for this fact is quite another affair; and on this question we entertain very decided opinions, and that not at all in unison with our author, if we are to understand him as meaning that the writings of Moses, or even those of Herodotus, were expressions of the popular mind. Setting aside the inspiration of Moses, as a distinct and far higher ground for confidence, the writings of such men is in advance of their generation, and they lead the people, not the people them. It is implied even here, by the heart of Moses being spoken of as its source; but it should not be left ambiguous by looseness or inaccuracy of expression.

Herodotus and the Grecian writers were altogether ignorant of the writings of Moses; and in this respect we possess an immense advantage over them in prosecuting historical researches into the early history of mankind, which advantage we ought not to neglect, while we may also properly avail ourselves of their investigations of the Egyptian monuments—the only records of ancient history to which they had access. "But as those monuments, even where intelligible, do not contain the word of living tradition, so are the lists of kings and series of years mere dry skeletons without life and vital coherence—names without events, dates without history—even without any such strict and intelligible chronology as the historian requires." During three centuries and a half, from Herodotus even to Apollodorus, the critical research of Greece was engaged in disentangling the confusion and adjusting the chronology of Egyptian history. "What the school of Aristotle had prepared, and Manetho, under Greek auspices but with Egyptian learning, had matured, Eratosthenes, of Cyrene, and Apollodorus, of Athens, especially the former, carried to perfection" (150).

We have not formed so high an opinion of Eratosthenes as that which is here expressed by the Chevalier Bunsen; not from thinking meanly of the critical researches of the Greeks, but simply because they had no sufficient materials for accu-

rate investigation. The monuments are all of one people, and the interpetation of them was entirely in the hands of the same people; and a single class among that people, vain-glorious and superstitious to a proverb, with no possible means of detecting falsehood or qualifying exaggeration by collateral checks. The priests alone had possession of the books and understood their contents, and Egypt alone was the theme—Egypt at that time degraded and under foreign sway—but which they prided themselves on representing as having been formerly, and that during incalculable periods of time, governed, by demigods, and monopolizing the riches and the homage of the universe. And with great show of reason could they do this, seeing that they have in their still existing palaces and temples prouder monuments of former splendour than any other land can boast of; but as even Herodotus was deceived in their legends concerning Sesostris, which the moderns are all but unanimous in rejecting as fabulous, so we think that many of the remaining traditions will hereafter be found to rest on no better foundation, and will have to be rejected in like manner. We cannot go into particulars at present, since the volume now before us is only introductory, and does not enter upon the historical questions themselves; but we have thought it fair to warn the author beforehand that we shall expect those points, to which our assent is required, to be both consistent with each other and in accordance with what we know concerning the history of other countries, especially as contained in the writings of Moses.

And there is one point to which we would beg leave to direct the special attention of the Chevalier Bunsen—that is, the astronomy of Egypt, as illustrating its chronology, and as enabling us to detect some of the sources of discrepancy between the various dates that have been assigned by Josephus, Clemens, and others, for such events as the Creation, the Deluge, and the Exode.

It appears from a note, at the thirty-ninth page, that the author is acquainted with a paper by Mr. Cullimore, on the "Tablets of Karnak and Abydos," which was read, in 1830, before the Royal Society of Literature; but he does not seem to be aware that another paper was read before the same body, which appeared to us a still more important one, as it treated on chronology in general. Mr. Cullimore called it, "Criteria for Determining in which Version of the Holy Scriptures the original Hebrew Computation of Time is Contained, with the Æras of Corruption." Such a determination could not but be of the greatest use in settling the Egyptian chronology; and the astronomical element resorted to by Mr. Cullimore is the precession of the equinoxes, in consequence of which the vernal

equinox which, at first, stood in the sign Taurus, passed gradually out of Taurus into Aries, and out of Aries into Pisces, before the commencement of the Christian æra, and since the birth of Christ the equinoctial point has passed through the sign Pisces also. The Egyptian, Chaldean, and Greek astronomers had all noticed this motion of the heavenly bodies, since on the entrance of the sun into some one of the signs, they relied for calculating the time of each one of their seasons, and the shifting of the equinox rendered a corresponding alteration necessary in all their calculations of the seasons; but this motion was so very slow that it required a very long course of observations, with the rude instruments employed by the ancients to attain anything approaching to accuracy, in estimating the rate at which the equinoctial point passed through the signs of the zodiac. The true rate of this precession is passing through one degree in seventy-one years and six months; but the early astronomers estimated it at one hundred years to each degree, producing an error of more than twenty-eight years too much in every century which they thus attempted to calculate; while the Arabians, from whom the modern Jews derived their calculations, as embodied in the Seder Olam, estimated the precession at sixty-six years to each degree, thus causing an error of more than five years too little in every century calculated by them. On these known mistakes of the old astronomers, Mr. Cullimore endeavours to account for the high numbers and lengthened spaces of time assigned to the Creation, and Deluge, and Exode in the Septuagint, and Alexandrine, and Clementine numbers, and for the low numbers and short spaces of time in the modern Hebrew computation; and this is done for the purpose of maintaining the correctness of the dates contained in the received Hebrew text, as digested by Archbishop Usher, and printed in the authorized English version, which Mr. Cullimore asserts that he finds to be in all respects conformable to correct astronomical data, and into which he conceives that it is scarcely possible that an error of more than four years can have crept, and that it is not probable that an error even to that small amount does occur. It would be in vain for us to attempt a sketch of this elaborate paper in our narrow limits: we can only say the actual divergencies in the various schemes of chronology, some of which are noticed by the Chevalier Bunsen (p. 182), receive an explanation by means of Mr. Cullimore's paper, which tallies so exactly with their several discrepancies, and accounts for them so completely, that it has all the *primâ facie* characteristics of truth, and that we shall continue to credit it until we get something better.

Sir Isaac Newton in his chronology had made use of the

same element for testing the dates of the early history of Greece, and he found that they always erred in excess: the events were placed at too remote a distance of time. He computes that, in the time of Hipparchus, B.C. 147—

"The equinox must have gone back eleven degrees since the Argonautic expedition—that is (it receded thus much), in one thousand and ninety years according to the chronology of the ancient Greeks *then in use;* and this is after the rate of about ninety-nine years, or, in the next round number, one hundred years to a degree, as was then stated by Hipparchus; but it really went back a degree in seventy-two years, and eleven degrees in seven hundred and ninety-two years..... The Greeks, therefore, made the Argonautic expedition about three hundred years ancienter than the truth" (Chron. 94).

But this precession of the equinoxes enables us to offer a probable explanation of that which Herodotus was told by the Egyptian priests, and which, without explanation, cannot but be rejected—namely, that the sun had twice risen in parts different from what is his customary place. It is well known that long before the time of Herodotus the twelve signs of the zodiac, or the solar circuit divided into twelve parts, were considered as the solar mansions, and one of these signs was considered as his "*customary place*" for each one of the months of the year—Aries being synonymous with March, if during March the sun was in Aries, and so on. But before the time of Hipparchus the zodiac was not fixed as at present, when for astronomical purposes we continue to suppose the equinoctial point to stand in the horn of the Ram, though it has passed more than twenty-seven degrees from that point since the time of Hipparchus. In preceding times the year had not kept its signs unaltered; but commencing with that sign which denoted the sun's place at the vernal equinox, the first month changed its sign when the equinoctial point, having passed through one sign of the zodiac, was entering upon another sign. And thus, what the priests told Herodotus seems to have been that the sun had shifted its place in the zodiac to the extent of two signs.

The sun is found, in hieroglyphics, sometimes on the head of a bull—sometimes over the shoulder—sometimes on the head of a ram, which indicates the same passage of the sun from one sign to another. And when the signs of the zodiac were placed in a single row, as is the case on some of the monuments, the change of the sign for the first month of the year would have the effect of making that sign, which had formerly been *the last* in the row to become *the first*, as we actually find existing zodiacs beginning with Taurus and ending with Aries. And we should thus have a probable explanation of the other part of the state-

ment made to Herodotus, of the sun having formerly risen where he then set, if the former place were indicated by a figure at *the other extremity* of the line.

But the services rendered by Mr. Cullimore do not terminate with his paper on the correction of these discordant systems of chronology. He has written also on the ancient Chaldean and Egyptian chronology, as deducible from their zodiacs and cycles, and the long periods of time which usher in the proper historical epochs and authentic veritable kings. Pliny, on the authority of Epigenes, gives the Chaldeans credit for observations extending through 720,000 years. After remarking on the other enormous periods found in Berosus, Hipparchus, Cicero, and Diodorus, Mr. Cullimore proceeds: "These periods, we know from the evidence of ancient writers and common sense, compared with the prophetic periods of Scripture, in which days are put to represent years, consist of years put for diurnal revolutions. Hence the 720,000 days of Epigenes amount to 1971 Julian years and 92 days, or 68¼ years more than the period of Callisthenes, originating B.C. 2233.

Mr. Cullimore then shows that the embolismal period of the Chaldeans, of 1440 years, would, from their not knowing the exact length of the year, require the addition of 46 years to correspond with the observations.

"But 1440 + 46 = 1486 years; and this period, computed from the Chaldean era, B.C. 2,233, conducts us to the vernal equinox in the year, B.C. 747, *which is the era of Nabonassar;* when the equinox fell on March 28, of the Julian year, and the first Chaldean month (Adar) coinciding with the second Egyptian month (Paophi) in the vague Sothoic year, then originating on the 26th of February. Hence *a new embolismal period originating from the era of Nabonassar;* and thus Hipparchus had not much difficulty in transferring the Chaldean observations into the Egyptian calendar ... Thus it is evident that the era of Nabonassar *is not fixed* to the year, B.C. 747, *because* it was the *first year* of that prince's reign, as Syncellus conjectured; or because the Babylonians at that time revolted from the Assyrians or Medes, as modern writers have generally supposed; but because the old Chaldean calendar then became finally corrected in the natural course of the celestial revolutions, and a new embolismal period set out. Thus, there is an indissoluble astronomical connection between the old Chaldean era, B.C. 2233, and the new era of Nabonassar, B.C. 747; and hence we obtain another demonstration of the authenticity of the former, in addition to the before-mentioned combination of evidence, and a satisfactory origin for the latter. The first Chaldean astronomical era is of great importance, because it not only demonstrates that science was far advanced in the early postdiluvian ages, but because it establishes as direct a synchronism between the times of the first Chaldean Belus and the builders of the tower of Babel, as that established by the Pto-

lemaic canon between Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and Zedekiah, king of Judah.....The building of this tower is, by profane writers, uniformly ascribed to Belus. These facts, combined with Varro's era of the Ogygian or first deluge, 1600 years before the Olympic era, or B.C. 2376, afford a very exact approximation to the sacred Hebrew chronology."

Mr. Cullimore also shows that, although the Egyptians acknowledged that they derived their first acquaintance with astronomy from the Chaldeans, yet the science was carried to far greater perfection in Egypt, as may be inferred from an examination of their astronomical periods of time. We can only advert to one of these as an instance: the 48,863 years of Diogenes Laertius, and Censorinus:—

"According to the Egyptians, there elapsed, from Vulcan, the son of Nilus, who discovered the first principles of philosophy, to Alexander king of Macedon, 48,863 years, during which period there had been observed 373 solar and 832 lunar eclipses. This immense period, which has variously exercised the ingenuity of learned men to reduce it within the scope of historical time, seems absolutely to explain itself; for it is very plainly the cycle formed by the civil precession of the equinoxes, or of the recession of the tropical solar year through the Sothoic fixed year of 365 days 6 hours, the parent of the Julian year; and is allegorically said to commence with Vulcan and end with Alexander, like the Egyptian zodiacal revolution of 36,525 vague Sothoic years, which we are told, in the old Egyptian chronicle, elapsed from Vulcan to Alexander; for the Egyptians indulged their love of antiquity by making their empire coeval in duration with the utmost cycles of the heavenly motions: the one period is of a nature purely astronomical, and so is the other. The Gregorian omission of three bissextiles in four centuries supposes the great cycle of civil precession to be 48,700 years."

M. Bailly estimated that these 373 solar and 832 lunar eclipses might be observed in a climate like that of Egypt in the space of 1200 or 1300 years, and would, therefore, ascend to 1500 or 1600 B.C; and Simplicius, in his commentary on Aristotle, affirms that the Egyptian astronomy dated 2000 years from his own time, which would ascend to B.C. 1500. Now, these improvements in astronomy are ascribed to a second Belus, who lived in the 15th century before our own era. For Diodorus says,

"—— that the Egyptian Belus, son of Neptune and Lybia, carried colonies to Babylonia, and established a college of priests on the Euphrates, whom the Babylonians call Chaldeans, and who observed the stars after the manner of the Egyptian astrologers. But the Egyptian Belus was the father of Danaus, who fled with Cadmus from Egypt shortly after the Exode, as Diodorus elsewhere declares; and

the age both of Moses and of Danaus synchronises with the above-mentioned epoch of the Egyptian eclipses and tropical year in the fifteenth century before Christ, according to all original authorities, both sacred and profane. The departure of Moses from Egypt, in his eighty-first year, is fixed to the year 1491 B.C. by the sacred Hebrew chronology; the flight of Cadmus to Phœnicia to 1494, and of Danaus to Argos, to 1486, by the Parian chronicle."

Mr. Cullimore concludes that the perfection in these respects of the old astronomical calculations could only have been attained by long continued observations, and that Egypt continued to be thus distinguished down to the time of Thales. The commencement of the time of ignorance, and long ages of barbarism, may be dated from the Persian conquest of Egypt, and especially from the havoc perpetrated under Cambyses. From that time forward the arcana of science lay hid among the priests who clothed their systems in allegory, and called days years, and referred legal dynasties to astronomical cycles.

We have a direct object in referring to these papers, inasmuch as it clearly appears, from p. 14 of the work before us, that it is necessary to call the attention of the Chevalier Bunsen to this point; since he supposes that it would require observations extending over 10,000 years to record eclipses which M. Bailly estimates they might very well have observed in the space of 1200 or 1300 years; and this becomes the more necessary from the avowal that, in establishing the chronology of Egypt, a foundation is intended to be laid in order to "enquire whether it tallies with scriptural tradition as to the creation of mankind," and whether "there was one universal or several partial or local floods?"—and, lastly, "what light is thrown on the great question of the unity of the human race" (xxviii.)

Before such questions as these can be approached, it is evident that the chronology of Egypt must be placed on a basis at least as sure as that on which the scriptural chronology rests for its external claims to credibility. It is not sufficient that the Chevalier Bunsen may be himself convinced of the truth of what he proposes: he must also have the assent of all who are competent, by education and information, to give an opinion; for this is the ordeal through which the Scriptures have passed and have abidden the test. The claims of the Bible rest not upon the dictum of one man, nor the concurrence of a few individuals; but upon the united testimony of the universal Church—that is, the wisest and best of men of all generations. And it has not been a blind or superstitious assent given without enquiry and with no exercise of thought; but, on the contrary, it has been expressed after full discussion of objections brought

against it by shrewd and subtle men, who have been, point by point, answered and refuted by the fathers of the Church, most of whom were far superior in education and training to the men of the present generation, and had, moreover, the vast advantage of concentrating their talents on the one single object; added to all which is the sacred truth which is involved in every enquiry touching the veracity of Scripture—the very basis of Christianity being the creation, and the fall, and the unity of the human race; and the credibility of Christ and the apostles, in all respects, being affected by their declarations concerning these things, which are not mere statements of fact, but are made by them to be articles for faith, and signs for future warning, and grounds of argument or appeal.

The present volume being only introductory, and not containing the arrangement of the several dynasties so as to reconcile Eratosthenes and Manetho, the time is not come for speaking fully on that most important branch of the enquiry; but, from what we can gather, it is very probable that we shall not find reason to differ materially from the Chevalier Bunsen, who regards the whole series as divided into three empires, the middle one of which embraces the time of the Hyksos, or shepherds, who come in after the twelfth dynasty of Manetho and continue till the sixteenth. But we have ever regarded these shepherds as Arabians rather than Canaanites, and certainly not as at any time to be confounded with the Israelites, which last were, indeed, like them in occupation and were therefore disliked by the Egyptians; but were not THE shepherds who were held in dread as well as abomination by the subjects of Pharaoh. We believe that the Egyptians had been harrassed from very early times by the predatory incursions of the Arabs, all of whom, from their wandering unsettled habits, they regarded as shepherds. And we must place the dread of them at a very early age, since it operated when the family of Jacob first went down into Egypt and the children of Israel consisted of only seventy souls. But, if they were Arabs, they must still enter Egypt round the point of the Red Sea: consequently by the same way as Canaanites or any other invaders from the east, and they might therefore be confounded with Amalekites, or might really be of many distinct tribes.

Even concerning the tablet of Karnak we agree to one of the principles which is laid down—namely, that it should be regarded as consisting of two perfectly distinct parts divided by the central line, the left hand half being the more important and relating to the royal line of ancestry whom Thothmos succeeded on the throne, the right hand half being less dis-

against it by shrewd and subtle men, who have been, point by point, answered and refuted by the fathers of the Church, most of whom were far superior in education and training to the men of the present generation, and had, moreover, the vast advantage of concentrating their talents on the one single object; added to all which is the sacred truth which is involved in every enquiry touching the veracity of Scripture—the very basis of Christianity being the creation, and the fall, and the unity of the human race; and the credibility of Christ and the apostles, in all respects, being affected by their declarations concerning these things, which are not mere statements of fact, but are made by them to be articles for faith, and signs for future warning, and grounds of argument or appeal.

The present volume being only introductory, and not containing the arrangement of the several dynasties so as to reconcile Eratosthenes and Manetho, the time is not come for speaking fully on that most important branch of the enquiry; but, from what we can gather, it is very probable that we shall not find reason to differ materially from the Chevalier Bunsen, who regards the whole series as divided into three empires, the middle one of which embraces the time of the Hyksos, or shepherds, who come in after the twelfth dynasty of Manetho and continue till the sixteenth. But we have ever regarded these shepherds as Arabians rather than Canaanites, and certainly not as at any time to be confounded with the Israelites, which last were, indeed, like them in occupation and were therefore disliked by the Egyptians; but were not THE shepherds who were held in dread as well as abomination by the subjects of Pharaoh. We believe that the Egyptians had been harrassed from very early times by the predatory incursions of the Arabs, all of whom, from their wandering unsettled habits, they regarded as shepherds. And we must place the dread of them at a very early age, since it operated when the family of Jacob first went down into Egypt and the children of Israel consisted of only seventy souls. But, if they were Arabs, they must still enter Egypt round the point of the Red Sea: consequently by the same way as Canaanites or any other invaders from the east, and they might therefore be confounded with Amalekites, or might really be of many distinct tribes.

Even concerning the tablet of Karnak we agree to one of the principles which is laid down—namely, that it should be regarded as consisting of two perfectly distinct parts divided by the central line, the left hand half being the more important and relating to the royal line of ancestry whom Thothmos succeeded on the throne, the right hand half being less dis-

tinguished, and, as we think, the ancestors of his queen; though Bunsen agrees with Lepsius in seeking for the Hyksos or shepherds on this side of the monument. We do not see on what ground this is done by them; nor can we deem it probable that such a Pharaoh as Thothmos would pay such honour as is implied in making offerings to a race which was held in such abomination by the Egyptians—an honour which is tantamount to deification. And, as we have already stated, we differ from all who would regard the two upper lines of rings as belonging to personages intended to be placed in the same rank with those of the two lower lines, so as to swell to so unreasonable a number the Pharaoh lists.

That part of the volume which relates to the Egyptian language and to hieroglyphical writing is very full and complete, so as to leave us little more to desire and nothing at present to remark, excepting that even here the attempt is made to carry us too far back, and to make the art of writing coeval with the very earliest ages of Egyptian grandeur—an opinion which cannot, we think, be sustained by any existing monuments. We are willing to concede that some knowledge of writing existed at the time when the phonetic use of hieroglyphics began to appear on the monuments; but we think that this can only be asserted from the time when the double rings began to appear, and it has not yet been proved that this took place on contemporary monuments earlier than the reign of Osortasen. The appearance of double rings on monuments erected by Thothmos or Rameses, in honour of some remote ancestor, would not prove that writing was known in those remote times; still less is it to be inferred from the appearance of writing implements on the earliest monuments; for these implements denote sculpture as well as writing, and hieroglyphics were written as early as they were engraved; and it is not mere writing, but writing *for phonetic purposes*, that we are calling in question. There is nothing in the fact that the single rings are capable of being read phonetically, as in those of the builders of the pyramids, Apoph, Remai, or Oan, the father of Osortasen, on some of his monuments, &c. This would be the case as soon as hieroglyphics began to be so employed; but it would by no means follow that the bearers of those rings were so called *by their contemporaries*—still less that *hieroglyphics* were then used *phonetically*. And we even believe that this has been a source of confusion, causing one individual to be called by different names: we therefore greatly object to the practice of giving a phonetic value to any single rings of this kind.

Josephus has drawn a distinction between the sacred dialect

and the ordinary language, which Chevalier Bunsen seems to qualify by saying, "All sacred language is, however, essentially nothing but an earlier stage of the popular dialect preserved by means of the sacred books" (258). This is, no doubt, the case in some instances, and especially in modern languages; but is not universally so: and, in very early times and in eastern countries, we should say that the distinction pointed out by Josephus would generally hold good, especially among nations of a reverential turn of mind, and where the priesthood was regarded as entrusted with a sacred deposit. The Hebrew had its sacred and its demotic or ordinary form of letters from very early ages, as we learn by the shekels and by the Samaritan Pentateuch; and this distinction is retained to the present day in the biblical and rabbinical characters. In the Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Sanscrit languages, we recognise the same kind of differences between the sacred and ordinary characters, which, in all these cases, we believe extends to the dialect also. And, indeed, all that we contend for is in substance granted, in allowing that "it does not follow that the more modern idiom is every where the immediate offspring of the sacred language," for the people must of course understand both.

In the chapter on the primitive elements of the ancient Egyptian language, some remarks occur which may throw a new and unexpected light upon its connection with the Hebrew and its derivation—if not from the Hebrew, from some source in common with Hebrew. The Chevalier has been expressing a hope that some vestiges of the ancient Coptic may even yet be recovered, and that not only some of its peculiar and long-lost sounds,

"——but that even the language itself may still maintain a wretched existence in some retired villages of the Thebaid. Should this be the case, it would certainly be worth while to collect and study its remains. The loss of the living traditional pronunciation implies a loss of much more than what we generally call pronunciation. Lepsius, in one of his letters, has called attention to a circumstance which may be of considerable importance in promoting the restoration of the Egyptian phonetic system. He remarks, that the vowel, forming the termination of certain polysyllabic Egyptian words in Coptic, always forms part of the sound of the first syllable—for instance, Abydos, in Coptic *Ebot*, is written hieroglyphically *Ebt-u;* Anubis, *Anp-u;* Month, *Mnt-u*; Chons, *Xns-u*. *Jom*, the Coptic word for *sea*, is written, in hieroglyphics, *ima*, where the Coptic pronunciation is corroborated by the Hebrew, *iom*. The real explanation of this mode of writing appears to be that the Egyptians, in attempting to express a vowel not in itself radical, but merely phonetic, inherent in one or two consonants, adopted for that purpose signs which express the corresponding radical

vowel. This radical vowel, however, they regularly threw back to the end of the word "to prevent the possibility of its being taken in its primitive signification" (277).

But whence did the Egyptians learn this distinction between radical and phonetic vowels? It is not to be found in Greek, from whence the Coptic alphabet was borrowed; but it is pre-eminently the case in Hebrew, and is a distinction extending to consonants as well as vowels, which has passed into several of the Eastern languages, that are indisputably derived from the Hebrew: and the vowels being thus placed at the end of the word shows that the mental operations by which we apprehend *both* the *sense* and the *sound* of a word, which really are two distinct acts of thought, were kept distinct by them; the sound being an after-thought determined by the sense intended to be conveyed, as is the case in the pointing of the Hebrew consonants, though, in our modern way of writing, this distinction scarcely appears. So distinct were the two operations in Hebrew that the writing of the consonants, and inserting the vowels by means of points, were seldom done at the same time —scarcely ever by the same individual: the text was written by one scribe, the points were added by another, who was called the *pointer*, and had made it his peculiar study: and some of the errors which have crept into manuscripts by the negligence of the first scribe are found to have been corrected by the second: and, as the ink of the one might accidentally differ from that of the other, persons who have not been aware of this circumstance might imagine that a difference in colour, between the letters and the points, would indicate an interval of centuries between the writing of the text and the insertion of the points, when there may have been only the usual interval of a few days. The Egyptian words had also another remarkable feature in common with the Hebrew language of strengthening the signification of a word by reduplication of its root—as *apep*, from *ap*; *petpet*, from *pet*; *papa*, from pa: and a still stronger case of analogy is found in the construction of sentences. The time, however, is not yet come for entering satisfactorily on this branch of the subject. The Chevalier Bunsen defers to his fifth book, and to a future volume, the historical comparison of languages, merely intending, on the present occasion, to give some general facts relative to the primitive formation and writing of roots: and it is rather discouraging to be told that—

"The number of the Egyptian roots, with which we are acquainted, is not as yet sufficient to enable us to make them the basis of a thorough investigation of comparative philology. To do this will require, at least, ten more years of European research—an indeterminate period,

indeed—unless far more time and talent be dedicated to the subject than heretofore, and unless every branch of it be studied without interruption upon some clear and well-regulated system. The first thing to be done is to chisel it out in the rough" (280).

The length to which we have extended our remarks is a proof of the importance which we attach to this publication, although only the first volume of a projected series. Instead of indulging in general eulogy, which we could have conscientiously bestowed, we have thought it better to direct our readers' attention to those points which struck us as being most important in these enquiries: and if in anything that we have said the subject should be placed in a new point of view before the Chevalier Bunsen, so as to induce him to reconsider those particulars in which we have expressed a difference of opinion, and those collateral topics to which we have adverted, our end will be fully answered.

Of the Chevalier himself we desire to speak with the greatest respect—with admiration of his varied talents, and of his especial attainments in this branch of ancient history, on which such a flood of unexpected light has been poured by the progress which has been already made in decyphering Egyptian hieroglyphics. We doubt not that the publication of the volume before us will create or increase emulation in others, so as to direct their talents into this channel, the opening of which is one of the most conspicuous achievements of modern science: and by united researches mature some well-regulated system, in the pursuit of which such a combination of results may be attained as will harmonise with all the truth which is at present known and held, and add thereto its own new and conclusive species of corroboration.

And we have no fear for the sacred truths contained in the volume of holy Scripture: these stand on a basis so firm as to defy all assaults, as the rock withstands the waves of the sea and shakes them off broken into foam. The Chevalier, we are persuaded, does not intend to assail anything which he believes we ought to hold sacred—nothing, perchance, which we do so reverence: therefore to him we have only to say that we regard Scripture as the source of light, as well as the basis of all truth; and that we hold it to be the surest guide to those who are exploring unknown regions, as well as the touchstone for determining the value of the things that are discovered.

ART. VIII.—*Diary and Correspondence of Samuel Pepys, F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the Reigns of Charles II. and James II.: with a Life and Notes.* By RICHARD, LORD BRAYBROOKE. The Third Edition, considerably enlarged. Volume I. London: Colburn. 1848.

THIS, as the title imports, is an amplified edition of a work which, in its abridged form, will be familiar to many of our readers. There is, however, in the book, as now presented to us, so much of new matter that we feel justified, and, probably, but acquit ourselves of a duty, in dealing with it as an original publication. The diary of even the humblest individual would possess an interest and convey a lesson in which an autobiography, with all its attraction, would be found wanting. Autobiographies are ever penned for the eyes of others. The diary is a written soliloquy, in which the heart speaks out without disguise, and *to itself*. In an autobiography the gloze of self-love is on every passage; obliquities, if not removed, are softened down; and motives, widely differing from the true ones, are linked with bad, or, to say the least, with doubtful actions. Indeed, in many instances, an autobiography is little else than an apology for time ill-spent and opportunities cast to the winds; but a diary is a different thing—at least such a diary as that before us: the fact of its having been written in short-hand being presumptive, if not conclusive, evidence, of its not having been intended for the eye of posterity. Independantly however of this presumptive proof we have evidence more unequivocal in the confessions of weakness, folly, and even sin, with which these pages abound. That these confessions did not originate in induration of conscience, engendered by the profligacy of the times in which Pepys lived, is abundantly proved by the expressions of remorse which so frequently followed on acts of folly or sin. The truth is—at least we gather it from the pages before us—that he was started in the world with a capital which is better than silver or gold—religious principles: all honour to honest John Pepys, citizen and tailor, his immediate progenitor! Pepys was a man of no mean abilities; but he was of an order of mind calculated rather to receive than to give the tone to the society in which he moved; and the marvel is that he did not oftener yield to the temptation and evil example by which he was surrounded. The keeping of a diary such as this—in which every error is "noted, set in a book"—im-

plies no small amount of moral courage: many doubtless, and bitter, were the tears shed upon its pages from the retrospective eye of the writer.

A brief outline of the history of the journalist may be an acceptable, and perhaps necessary, preface to our further consideration of the volume under notice. Samuel Pepys, though believed to have been descended from a younger branch of an ancient family, does not appear to have prided himself much on his ancestry. He was born on the 23rd February, 1632, received the rudiments of education at the Huntingdon School, whence he was removed to St. Paul's, where he continued until 1650, when his name appears as that of a sizar at Trinity College, Cambridge. He subsequently removed to Magdalene. In October, 1655, he married; and in 1658 we find him attending Sir Edward Montagu in his expedition to the Sound. The first entry in his diary is, 1st January, 1659-60. It was continued for nine years, when, from defect of sight, he was compelled to relinquish it. "A more interesting moment for the commencement of a journal (remarks the noble editor) could not well have been selected, as we are at once introduced to the most minute and circumstantial details of the exciting events preceding the Restoration." After having accompanied his patron, Sir Edward Montagu, to Scheveling, to bring back Charles II., he was nominated Clerk of the Acts of the Navy, and was assigned a residence in a house belonging to the Navy-office, in Seething-lane. In this capacity he won the confidence of the Lord High Admiral, the Duke of York. During the plague in 1665, when London was deserted and every branch of the service abandoned, the whole concern of the navy devolving upon him, Pepys remained at his post. "You, sir (he writes to Sir W. Coventry at this juncture), took your turn of the sword: I must not grudge, therefore, to take mine of the pestilence." Pepys was eminently useful at the time of the fire of London. Like Single-speech Hamilton, he gained much applause by an effort in Parliament, but never made any figure in it afterwards. In 1673, the Duke of York having, on the passing of the Test Act, resigned all his employments, the King appointed Pepys Secretary for the Affairs of the Navy. His success, however, appears to have created him enemies; for we find him subsequently committed to the Tower, whence he was released and again employed by the King, who, having afterwards assumed the office of High Admiral, reinstated Pepys as secretary. On the accession of William and Mary Pepys lost his office and retired into private life; whither,

however, he was pursued by his enemies, and committed, on pretence of attachment to the exiled family, to the Gatehouse. The charge appears to have been abandoned, as we find him afterwards at liberty. The rest of his life appears to have been passed usefully in retirement. He died, after a long illness, on the 26th May, 1703. The "Diary" commences with—

"1659-60.—Blessed be God, at the end of the last year I was in very good health, without any sense of my old pain but upon taking of cold. I lived in Axe-yard, having my wife, and servant Jane, and no other in family than us three."

Although there is much curious matter in every page of the "Diary," our limits do not allow of our making any copious extracts from the introductory portion of it—it being inferior in interest to the sequel. From these early pages, however, we gather the fact of the growing feeling on the part of the nation in favour of the exiled family; preparing us for the change which shortly afterwards occurred. One or two characteristic passages we cannot refrain from quoting:—

"Jan. 1, 1659-60 (Lord's day). This morning (we living in the garret), I rose, put on my suit with great skirts—having not lately worn any other clothes but them—went to Mr. Gunning's Chapel at Exeter House, where he made a very good sermon upon these words —'That in the fulness of time God sent his Son made of a woman,' &c.; showing that by 'made under the law' is meant the circumcision, which is solemnized this day: dined at home in the garret, where my wife dressed the remains of a turkey, and in the doing of it she burned her hand."

Under date of the 2nd of February following, he write that he was "up in the morning and had some red herrings to our breakfast, while my boot-heel was a-mending; by the same token, the boy left the hole as big as it was before."

Pepys having been appointed "secretary to the two generals of the fleet," accompanied his patron, Sir Edward Montagu, to Scheveling to bring home Charles II. We have the following interesting narrative of the King's embarkation for England. We should mention, in explanation of the term "my lord" so frequently occurring in the "Diary," that this title, "not by right nor even by courtesy," was often given to the republican officers and their dependants.

"The King, with the two Dukes and Queen of Bohemia, Princesse Royalle, and Prince of Orange, come on board, where I, on their coming in, kissed the King's, Queen's, and Princess's hands, having done the other before. Infinite shooting off of the guns, and

that in a disorder on purpose, which was better than if it had been otherwise. All day, nothing but lords and persons of honour on board, that we were exceeding full. Dined in a great deal of state, the royalle company by themselves in the coach, which was a blessed sight to see. After dinner, the King and Duke altered the name of some of the ships—viz., *Nazeby* into *Charles;** the *Richard*, *James;* the *Speaker*, *Mary;* the *Dunbar* (which was not in company with us), the *Henry; Winsley*, *Happy Return; Wakefield*, *Richmond; Lambert*, the *Henrietta; Cheriton*, the *Speedwell; Bradford*, the *Successe*. That done, the Queen, Princesse Royalle, and Prince of Orange, took leave of the King, and the Duke of York went on board the *London*, and the Duke of Gloucester, the *Swifture*, which done we weighed anchor, and with a fresh gale and most happy weather *set sail for England*. All the afternoon the King walked here and there, up and down (quite contrary to what I thought him to have been), very active and stirring. Upon the quarter-deck, he fell into discourse of his escape from Worcester, where it made me ready to weep to hear the stories that he told of his difficulties that he had passed through, as his travelling four days and three nights on foot, every step up to his knees in dirt, with nothing but a green coat and a pair of country breeches on, and a pair of country shoes that made him so sore all over his feet that he could scarcely stir. Yet he was forced to run away from a miller and other company that took them for rogues; his sitting at table at one place, where the master of the house, that had not seen him in eight years, did know him, but kept it private; when at the same table there was one, that had been of his own regiment at Worcester, could not know him, but made him drink the King's health and said that the King was at least four fingers higher than he. At another place, he was by some servants of the house made to drink, that they might know that he was not a Roundhead, which they swore he was. In another place, at his inn, the master of the house, as the King was standing with his hands upon the back of a chair by the fireside, kneeled down and kissed his hand privately, saying that he would not ask him who he was, but bid God bless him whither he was going. Then the difficulties in getting a boat to get into France, where he was fain to plot with the master thereof to keep his design from the foreman and a boy (which was all the ship's company), and so get to Fècamp, in France. At Rouen, he looked so poorly that the people went into the room, before he went away, to see whether he had not stolen something or other. In the evening I went up to my lord to write letters for England, which we sent away with word of our coming by Mr. Edward Pickering. The King supped alone in the coach; after that I got a dish, and we four supped in our cabin, as at noon. About bed-time my Lord Bartlett [properly Lord Berkeley, of Berkeley] who [whom] I had offered my services to

* "The *Nazeby*, now no longer England's shame,
But better to be lost in Charles his name."
—*Dryden's Astræa Reduc.*

before, sent for me to get him a bed, who [whom] with much ado I did get to bed with my Lord Middlesex in the great cabin below, but I was cruelly troubled before I could dispose of him, and quit myself of him."

Then follows a profane jest of Killegrew, which might have been omitted, characteristic though it be of the profligacy of the times. After this he writes:—

"At supper the three doctors of physique again at my cabin; where I put Dr. Scarborough in mind of what I heard him say, that children do, in every day's experience, look several ways with both their eyes, till custom teaches them otherwise; and that we do now see but with one eye, our eyes looking in parallel lines."

To this remark—*dpropos* to nothing as it appears to us—he adds:—"After this discourse, I was called to write a pass for my Lord Mandeville to take up horses to London, which I wrote in the King's name, and carried to him to sign, which was the first and only one that ever he signed in the ship *Charles*." The landing of the King in England is thus related:—

"By the morning we were come close to the land, and every body made ready to get on shore. The King and the two dukes did eat their breakfast before they went; and there being set some ship's diet before them, only to show them the manner of the ship's diet, they eat of nothing else but pease, and pork, and boiled beef. I had Mr. Darcy in my cabin, and Dr. Clerke, who eat with me, told me how the King had given 50*l.* to Mr. Shepley for my lord's servants, and 500*l.* among the officers and common men of the ship. I spoke to the Duke of York about business, who called me Pepys by name, and, upon my desire, did promise me his future favour. Great expectation of the King's making some knights, but there was none. About noon (though the brigantine that Beale made was there ready to carry him), yet he would go in my lord's barge with the two dukes. Our captain steered, and my lord went along bare with him. I went, and Mr. Mansell, and one of the king's footmen, and a dog that the King loved, in a boat by ourselves, and so got on shore when the King did, who was received by General Monk with all imaginable love and respect at his entrance upon the land at Dover. Infinite the crowd of people and the gallantry of the horsemen, citizens, and noblemen of all sorts. The mayor of the town came and give him his white staff, the badge of his place, which the King did give him again. The mayor also presented him, from the town, a very rich Bible, which he took, and said it was the thing that he loved above all things in the world. A canopy was provided for him to stand under, which he did, and talked awhile with General Monk and others, and so, into a stately coach there set for him, and so away through the town towards Canterbury, without making any stay at Dover. The shouting and joy expressed by all is past imagination."

Nothing is too minute or trifling for our journalist, whether it concern his breakfast or his worldly prosperity. The following extract is to the point; yet we cannot but admire the thankfulness of heart which the reader will have occasion to notice throughout the volume:—

"30th May, 1660.—I did eat a dish of mackarel, newly catched, for my breakfast. All this morning making up my accounts, in which I counted that I had made myself now worth about 80*l.*, at which my heart was glad, and blessed God."

Under the date of the 31st of the same month, we find our author rejoicing in the possession of a pair of blue silk stockings, which seems to have put him in good humour with himself and all the world.

"Captain Sparling, of the *Assistance*, brought me a pair of silk stockings of a light blue, which I was much pleased with. This day the month ends. I, in very good health, and all the world in a merry mood, because of the King's coming. I begin to teach Mr. Edward, who has a very good foundation laid for his Latin by Mr. Fuller."

The "Mr. Edward" here alluded to was the son of his patron, Montagu. The Duke of York appears to have been liberal in the way of *largesse* to the friends of the Restoration. We quote the passage which records the fact; affording proof, at the same time, that the "vice-admiral, rear-admiral, and the captain" did not belong to a "temperance ship:"—

"Of the money that the Duke of York did give my lord's servants, twenty-two ducateens came to my share. I did give Mr. Shepley the fine pair of buckskin gloves that I bought for myself five years ago. Many Dover men came to dine with my lord. My lord at nine pins in the afternoon. Mr. Shepley tells me how my lord hath put me down for seventy guilders among the money given to my lord's servants, which my heart did much rejoice at. Sir R. Stayner told us how some of his men did grumble that no more of the duke's money do come to their share, and so would not receive any; whereupon he called up those that had taken it, and give them three shares a-piece more, which made good sport among the seamen. At night Mr. Cooke comes from London with letters, leaving all things there very gallant and joyful; and brought us word that the Parliament had ordered the 27th of May, the King's birthday, to be for ever kept as a day of thanksgiving for our redemption from tyranny, and the King's return to his government, he entering London that day. My poor wife has not been well: she would fain see me, and be at her house again, but we must be content. She writes how there was a talk that I should be knighted by the King, which they (the Joyces) laugh at; but I think myself happier in my wife and estate than they are. The captain came on board quite fuddled; the vice-admiral, rear-admiral, and he, had been drinking all day. Mr. Lord being now to sit in the House of

Peers, he endeavours to get Mr. Edward Montagu for Weymouth, and Mr. George for Dover."

June 2, 1660.—Pepys acknowledges his gratitude to his patron for the share assigned to him of the duke's bounty: indeed, Montagu would appear to have been a very sincere friend to his dependent, to whom he says, "We must have a little patience and we will rise together." Under the same date our worthy secretary counts the cost of the expedition to bring home the exiled monarch. The "sum total" is 6,538*l.*—he naively adds, "I wish we had the money."

That our journalist was not inaccessible to a bribe will be found in more than one passage of his history. Take an instance:—

"Much business at my lord's. This morning my lord went into the House of Commons, and there had the thanks of the house, in the name of the Parliament and Commons of England, for his late service to his King and country. A motion was made for a reward for him; but it was quashed by Mr. Annesly, who, above most men, is engaged to my lord, and craves favours. Lady Pickering told me the story of her husband's case, and desired my assistance with my lord, and did give me, wrapped up in paper, five pounds in silver. With my lord to Whitehall, and my Lady Pickering. My lord went at night with the King to Baynard's Castle to supper, and I home. My wife, and the girl, and dog came home to-day. I found a quantity of chocolate left for me, I know not from whom."

The instance recorded under the date of the 21st June, 1660, is more in the way of business:—

"At the Dog Tavern, Captain Curle, late of the *Maria*, gave me five pieces in gold, and a silver can for my wife, for the commission I did give him this day."

Jobbing, however, would not appear to be confined to the ruder sex; *ex. gr.*:—

"Thence to my lord's, and had the great coach to Brigham's, who give me a case of good julep, and told me how my lady Montri deals with him and others for their places, asking him five hundred pounds, though he was formerly the king's coachmaker, and sworn to it."

The uncertainty of his tenure of an appointment, the duties of which it is admitted on all hands he filled with unimpeachable ability and zeal, will be gathered from the following narrative:—

"July 12th.—Up early, and by coach to Whitehall with Commissioner Pett, where, after we had talked with my lord, I went to the Privy Seal and got my bill perfected there, and at the Signet, and to the House of Lords, and met with Mr. Kipps, who directed me to

Mr. Beale to get my patent engrossed; but, he not having time to get it done in Chancery-hand, I was forced to run all up and down Chancery-lane and the six clerks' office, but could find none that could write the hand that were at leisure; and so, in despair, went to the Admiralty, where we met, the first time there, my Lord Montagu, my Lord Barkley (of Strattan), Mr. Coventry, and all the rest of the principal officers and commissioners, except only the comptroller, who is not yet chosen. 13th.—Up early; the first day put on my black camlet coat with silver buttons. To Mr. Spong, whom I found in his night-gown writing of my patent. It being done, we carried it to Worcester House,* to the Chancellor, where Mr. Kipps (a strange providence that he should now be in a condition to do me a kindness) got me the Chancellor's recipe to my bill, and so carried it to Mr. Beale for a dockett; but he was very angry and unwilling to do it, because he said it was ill writ (because I had got it writ by another hand and not by him); but, by much importunity, I got Mr. Spong to go to his office and make an end of my patent; and, in the meantime, Mr. Beale to be preparing my dockett, which being done I did give him two pieces, after which it was strange how civil and tractable he was to me. Met with Mr. Spong, who still would be giving me counsel of getting my patent out, for fear of another change and my Lord Montagu's fall. At the Navy-office I got leave to have a door made me into the leads. After that to Worcester House, where, by Mr. Kipps' means and my pressing in General Montagu's name to the Chancellor, I did, beyond all expectation, get my seal passed; and, while it was doing in one room, I was forced to keep Sir G. Carteret (who by chance met me there, ignorant of my business) in talk. To my wife, whom I had left in a coach, and presented her with my patent, at which she was overjoyed."

Under the date of 14th July, 1660, we find our author becoming a great man, and a poet dedicates a book to him.

"Comes in Mr. [Payne] Fisher, the poet, and promises me, what he had long ago done, a book in praise of the King of France, with my arms, and a dedication to me: very handsome."

Mr. Payne Fisher, if he had not the genius of a poet, shared the fate of his tribe; for we gather from a note that "he was frequently imprisoned for debt." His impartiality is beyond all question, inasmuch as he employed his sword at the battle of Marston Moor in the cause of the King; and, subsequently, his pen in the service of Cromwell, with whom he became, we are told, a great favourite.

Pepys would appear to have been a patron of art, in a small way; the entry of the 20th of July, 1660, being—

* The Earls of Worcester had a large house between Durham-place and the Savoy, which Lord Clarendon rented while his own was building

"I sent my wife to my father's, and he is to buy 5*l.* worth of pictures."

Another characteristic trait of our friend the poet—

"A boy brought me a letter from poet Fisher, who tells me that he is upon a panegyric of the king, and desired to borrow a piece of me; and I sent him half-a-piece."

Commend us to such a patron!—say we.

Joint stock companies under high patronage are not confined to our own speculative times—*ex. gr.*:—

"This day I heard the duke speak of a great design that he and my Lord of Pembroke have, and a great many others, of sending a venture to some part of Africa to dig for gold ore there. They intend to admit as many as will venture their money—250*l.* is the lowest share for every man."

The following passage has a melancholy historic interest:—

"Oct. 10, 1660.—At night comes Mr. Moore and tells me how Sir Hards. Waller* (who only pleads guilty), Scott, Coke,† Peters,‡ Harrison, &c., were this day arraigned at the bar of the Sessions House, there being upon the bench the Lord Mayor, General Monk, my Lord of Sandwich, &c.—such a bench of noblemen as had not been ever seen in England! They all seemed to be dismayed, and will all be condemned without question. In Sir Orlando Bridgman's charge§ he did wholly rip up the unjustness of the war against the king from the beginning; and so it much reflects upon all the Long Parliament: though the King had pardoned them, yet they must hereby confess that the King do look upon them as traitors. Tomorrow they are to plead what they have to say."

In quoting the sad sequel we may be pardoned for expressing our wonder that the barbarism of drawing and quartering has not long since been expunged from our statutes:—

"I went to Charing-cross to see Major-General Harrison‖ hanged, drawn, and quartered, which was done there—he looking as cheerful as any man could do in that condition. He was presently cut down and his head and heart shown to the people, at which there were great shouts of joy. It is said that he said he was sure to come shortly at

* Sir Hardress Waller, Knight, one of Charles I.'s judges. His sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life.

† Coke was solicitor to the people of England.

‡ Hugh Peters, the fanatical preacher.

§ Eldest son of John Bridgman, Bishop of Chester: became, after the Restoration, successively Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and Lord Keeper of the Great Seal; and was created a baronet. He is ancestor of the present Earl of Bradford.

‖ Thomas Harrison, son of a butcher at Newcastle-under-Lyne, appointed by Cromwell to convey Charles I. from Windsor to Whitehall, in order to take his trial, and afterwards sat as one of his judges.

the right hand of Christ to judge them that now had judged him, and that his wife do expect his coming again. Thus, it was my chance to see the King beheaded at Whitehall, and to see the first blood shed in revenge for the King at Charing-cross. Setting up shelves in my study."

That our journalist's loyalty was one of the habits which, to quote the words of a witty modern writer, "had lately come to him," will be gathered from the entry of the 26th October, 1660:—

"This morning Sir W. Penn and I were mounted early, and had very merry discourse all the way, he being very good company. We came to Sir W. Batten's, where he lives like a prince, and we were made very welcome. Among other things, he showed me my lady's closet, wherein was great store of rarities; as also a chair, which he calls 'King Harry's chair,' where he that sits down is catched with two irons that come round about him, which makes good sport. Here dined with us two or three more country gentlemen; among the rest, Mr. Christmas, my old schoolfellow, with whom I had much talk. He did remember that I was a great Roundhead when I was a boy; and I was much afraid that he would have remembered the words that I said the day the King was beheaded, that, were I to preach upon him, my text should be—'The memory of the wicked shall rot;" but I found afterwards that he did go away from school before that time. He did make us good sport in imitating Mr. Case,* Ash, and Nye, the ministers; but a deadly drinker he is and grown very fat."

The custom of sales by inch of candle, if not still existing, was of daily occurrence within our own recollection: we were not aware of its being of such antiquity as to have obtained in the days of Charles II. It would seem to have been new to Pepys:—

"Mr. Chetwind told me that he did fear that this late business of the Duke of York's would prove fatal to my Lord Chancellor. To our office, where we met all, for the sale of two ships, by an inch of candle—(the first time that ever I saw any of this kind)—where I observed how they do invite one another, and at last how they all do cry (*i.e.*, bid); and we have much to do to tell who did cry last. The ships were the *Indian*, sold for 1,300*l.*, and the *Half-Moon*, sold for 830*l.* Fell a-reading of the tryalls of the late men that were hanged for the King's death, and found good satisfaction in reading thereof."

The concluding sentence reflects little credit on our diarist's humanity, especially when we take into account his warm par-

* Thomas Case, one of the Assembly of Divines and some time rector of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields, æt., 1682, eighty-four. Simeon Ash, one of the leading Presbyterian ministers. Philip Nye, who had been minister of Kimbolton and rector of Acton, Middlesex, retired after his nonconformity, and died in 1672.

tizanship of the cause in which the unhappy culprits suffered. We gladly quit the subject for a more agreeable one:—

"To Sir W. Batten's to dinner, he having a couple of servants married to-day; and so there was a great number of merchants, and others of good quality, on purpose after dinner to make an offering which, when dinner was done, we did, and I did give ten shillings and no more, though I believe most of the rest did give more, and did believe that I did so too."

If there were, in our own times, more sympathy, on the part of the wealthy, with their dependents, there would be less discontent among the lower orders. The present age is no improvement upon the last in this particular, though we are bound to say that the higher we look in society the more we find of that sympathy. It is usually the *parvenu* who treats with scorn the class from which he has himself emerged. Take a royal portrait:—

"The Queen, a very little, plain, old woman, and nothing more in her presence in any respect nor grade than any ordinary woman. The Princess of Orange I had often seen before. The Princess Henrietta is very pretty, but much below my expectation; and her dressing of herself, with her haire frized short up to her ears, did make her seem so much the less to me; but my wife, standing near her with two or three black patches on, and well dressed, did seem to me much handsomer than she."

Our diarist would seem to be somewhat excursive in his devotional services. We are told that, in the forenoon of the 25th November, 1666, he went alone to his church, but—

"After dinner I went and ranged about to many churches; among the rest to the Temple, where I heard Dr. Wilkins a little, late Master of Trinity, in Cambridge."

We are told, in a note, that the divine here alluded to was the brother-in-law of the Protector—a circumstance, however, which did not interfere with his promotion, inasmuch as we find him made Bishop of Chester in 1668.

Pepys' discipline, as regards his domestics, would seem to have been somewhat of the roughest; for, under the date of the 1st of December, 1660, is the following entry:—

"This morning, observing some things to be laid up not as they should be by my girl, I took a broom and basted her till she cried extremely, which made me vexed; but, before I went out, I left her appeased."

The Admiralty of that day were occasionally greatly puzzled in "raising the supplies." Pepys seems to have prided

himself on the ingenuity of his scheme, which, however, we can scarcely understand as a remedy for the "growing charge:"—

"To the Duke of Yorke, and he tooke us into his closet, and we did open to him our project of stopping the growing charge of the fleet, by paying them in hand one moyety, and the other four months hence. This he do like. This day the Parliament voted that the bodies of Oliver, Ireton, Bradshaw, and Thomas Pride, should be taken up out of their graves in the abbey, and drawn to the gallows, and there hanged and buried under it; which (methinks) do trouble me that a man of so great courage as he was should have that dishonour, though otherwise he might deserve it enough."

The author, in the latter portion of the paragraph, exhibits more sympathy for the bones of the dead than, in the case of General Harrison, he did for the sufferings of the living:—

"To the Privy Seale, where I signed a deadly number of pardons, which do trouble me to get nothing by. I fell a reading Fuller's 'History of Abbys,' and my wife in 'Great Cyrus' till twelve at night, and so to bed."

The diarist, it seems, had no fancy for working for nothing. We are glad to turn from this confession of selfishness to a record of his affection for his father, whom it is but justice to add he uniformly treated with a consideration which he may have denied to other members of his family—his sister "Pall," for instance:—

"To the Exchequer, and did give my mother Bowyer a visit, and her daughters, the first time that I did see them since I went last to sea. My father did offer me six pieces of gold, in lieu of six pounds that he borrowed of me the other day; but it went against me to take of him, and, therefore, did not. Home and to bed, reading myself asleep, while the wench sat mending my breeches by my bedside."

Pretty and picturesque! We read, under date of 10th of January, 1661:—

"Mr. Davis told us the particular examination of these fanatiques that are taken; and, in short, it is this—these fanatiques, that have routed all the train-bands that they met with, put the King's life-guards to the run, killed about twenty men, broke through the city gates twice; and all this in the day-time, when all the city was in armes—are not in all above thirty-one. Whereas we did believe them (because they were seen up and down in every place almost in the city, and had been in Highgate* two or three days, and in several other places) to

* In Ken or Caen Wood, to which place Venner retreated with his followers (See Neal's "History of the Puritans"). The extent of Ken Wood must not be estimated by the small portion now surrounding Lord Mansfield's mansion. Ken Wood formed only a part of the large forest belonging to the see of London.

be at least five hundred—a thing that never was heard of, that so few men should dare and do so much mischief. Their word was, 'The King Jesus, and their heads upon the gates.' Few of them would receive any quarter, but such as were taken by force and kept alive; expecting Jesus to come here and reign in the *world presently, and* will not believe yet."

The valour of the train-bands was never, we believe, in very high repute, but in the affair thus described they were at least as brave as the King's life-guards. Happily the life-guards of Queen Victoria are men of other mould. It is well that these doughty heroes had not to deal with the grim Protector, whose mildest measure would have been to cashier them all.

On the 12th of January, 1661, we find our author under the infliction of one

"Major Waters (a deafe and most amorous melancholy gentleman, who is under a despayr in love, as the colonel told me, which makes him bad company, though a most good-natured man), by water to Redriff, and so on foot to Deptford."

We can well imagine the major to have been a "pretty considerable" bore under the circumstances described.

Under the date of the 18th of the same month, we find the record of a good resolution, formed, it would seem, on the score of ill health and a failing memory—namely, "To avoyd drinking often, which I am resolved, if I can, to leave off."

"This day (Jan. 21, 1660) many more of the Fifth-Monarchy men were hanged."

"There is nothing new under the sun."

—not even the name of the master-mariner in "Dombey and Son."

"Captain *Cuttle*, and Curtis, and Mootham,* and I, went to the Fleece Tavern to drink, and there we spent till four o'clock telling stories of Algiers, and the manner of life of slaves there. And, truly, Captain Mootham and Mr. Dawes† (who have been both slaves there) did make me fully acquainted with their condition there, as how they eat nothing but bread and water. At their redemption, they pay so much for the water they drink at the public fountaynes during their being slaves—how they are beat upon the soles of their feet and bellies at the liberty of their padron—how they are all at night called into their master's bugnard, and there they lie—how the poorest men do love their slaves best—how some rogues do live well if they do

* Peter Mootham, captain of the *Foresight*, afterwards slain in action.

† John Dawes, created a baronet in 1663, father of Sir William Dawes, Archbishop of York.

invent to bring their masters in so much a week by their industry or theft; and then they are put to no other work at all. And theft there is counted no great crime at all."

We may here remark that our diarist was a great play-goer, and set himself up for a critic in theatrical matters. On the 8th of February, 1661, he went to "Whitefriars," to see the "Mad Lover;" and, three days afterwards, to "Salisbury-court Playhouse, where not liking to sit, we went out again, and by coach to the theatre and there saw 'The Scornful Lady'" (a comedy by Beaumont and Fletcher). On the 1st of March following he witnesses the performance of "The Bondman," in Whitefriars, and eulogizes the acting of Betterton. On the next night we find him at Salisbury-court *playhouse*—a term which he seems to use in a sense different from that of *theatre*.

On the 8th of the same month he dines at Sir John Robinson's, meeting, among others, the Duchess of Albemarle, first the mistress and then the wife of General Monk; she was the daughter of a blacksmith, and "bred a milliner." Pepys describes her as "a plain, homely dowdy." She, however, exercised an unbounded influence over the general.

We find in a note a story of the church-door of Hadstock, in Essex, being covered with the skin of a Danish pirate, who had plundered the church. There is a tradition of a similar kind with reference to Worcester Cathedral; a portion of the skin said to have been attached to the doors of the latter was bequeathed by Dr. Prattienton to the Society of Antiquaries.

We find a curious entry under the date of the 6th of April, 1661:—

"Among other things, met with Mr. Townsend, who told us of his mistake the other day, to put both his legs through one of his knees of his breeches, and went so all day."

The feat of the bottle-conjuror was nothing to this. That Mr. Townsend would have accomplished this operation, under any circumstances, is sufficiently marvellous; but that he should have walked about all day, or even walked at all without discovering his error, entirely puzzles our philosophy.

On the 8th of the same month, he sleeps in a haunted room; and, waking in the night, is thrown into much trepidation when, "by the light of the moon, he saw his pillow (which over-night he had flung from him) stand upright."

On the 14th of April, he writes:—

"Easter, Lord's-day.—In the morning heard Mr. Jacomb at Lud-

gate upon these words, 'Christ loved you, and therefore let us love one another;" and made a *gracy* sermon, like a Presbyterian."

The epithet is new to us.

We have a long account of the coronation on the 23rd of April, 1661; but have not room for the quotation.

Our author's vow of sobriety would appear to have been but indifferently kept. We have the following humiliating confession, under the date of 29th Sept. 1661:—

"(Lord's Day)—What at dinner and supper I drink, I know not how, of my own accord, so much wine, that I was even almost foxed, and my head ached all night; so home and to bed, without prayers, which I never did yet, since I come to the house, of a Sunday night—I being now so out of order that I durst not read prayers for fear of being perceived by my servants in what case I was."

So often is one offence the parent of another!

Take another entry (11th Nov. 1661), in a different spirit:—

"Captain Ferrers carried me, the first time I ever saw any gaming-house, to one entering into Lincoln's-inn-Fields, at the end of Bell-yard, where strange the folly of men to lay and lose so much money, and very glad I was to see the manner of a gamester's life, which I see is very miserable, and poor, and unmanly."

On the last day of the year he renews his vows:—

"I have newly taken a solemn oath about abstaining from plays and wine, which I am resolved to keep according to the letter of the oath which I keep by me."

The next entry is a singular one:—

"Jan. 1.—Waking this morning out of my sleep on a sudden, I did, with my elbow, hit my wife a great blow over her face and neck which waked her with pain, at which I was sorry—and to sleep again."

"27th Same Month.—Going to take water upon Tower-hill, we met three sleddes standing there to carry my Lord Monson and Sir H. Mildmay, and another, to the gallows and back again, with ropes about their necks; which is to be repeated every year, this being the day of their sentencing the King."

We find about the same date a record of the diarist's thankfulness to God, forasmuch as, "since my leaving drinking of wine, I do find myself much better, and do mind my business better, and do spend less money, and less time in idle company." Among the recreations, and perhaps accomplishments, of our author, music would seem to be his favourite. We read of his fiddling before going to his office, —of his playing the flageolet; and on the 24th February, 1662, he writes:—

"Long with Mr. Berkenshaw in the morning at my musique practice, finishing my song of 'Gaze not on Swans,' in two parts, which pleases me well."

Under the date of the 25th of the same month, Pepys refers to a "great wind," which had blown down above 1,000 oaks and as many beeches in the Forest of Deane.

On the 5th of the following month we find:—

"To the pewterer's to buy a poore's box to put my forfeites in, upon breach of my late vows."

Reaping the reward of his amended manners, he writes on the 13th of the same month:—

"All day about business. Having lately followed my business much, I find great pleasure in it, and a growing content."

We have thus endeavoured to pioneer our readers through the first volume of this interesting work—interesting as regards the picture it gives us of the manners of the times; the light which it throws on the political history of the epoch; and, above all, the scope which it affords for the philosophical study of an individual mind—at all times a *profitable* study, inasmuch as it must necessarily reflect ourselves in many a fault and folly common to our nature. We think that, in the extracts we have made from this volume, we shall be considered to have established the proposition with which we set out—that Pepys was started in the world with something like sound principles, the result of a religious education. That he did not imbibe those principles from the company into which he was thrown is sufficiently evident. The "sea captains," albeit ever a gallant race, were not in his time likely to teach him lessons of sobriety, against which we find him so repeatedly offending. The tone of society derived from the example of a profligate court was not calculated to supply any deficiencies in his early teaching; and thus we are led to the conclusion that the ejaculatory deprecations of God's wrath, so frequently following the record of an offence against His laws, are attributable to the early inculcation of moral and religious truths. All honour, we say again, to honest John Pepys, citizen and tailor!—towards whom, whatever and however numerous may have been the errors of his son, the latter appears to have exhibited the deepest respect and warmest affection. We find our diarist, long after his official elevation, visiting his parent "in the cutting-room;" refusing—because he had not the *heart* to take them—six pieces which his father offered in repayment of a loan to that amount. And, perhaps, after all, the most convincing evidence of the

character of his early education, is deducible from a passage in the latter portion of the volume before us, to the effect that his father "could discern that he had been drinking, *which he did never see or hear of before.*"

That he was a man of no great elevation of mind is sufficiently evident. Although fond of money, and not scrupulous in availing himself of any excusable means of attaining it, he is often betrayed into what he himself designates as extravagance: thus, to some extent, illustrating the proverb—

"Alieni appetens, sui profusus."

His journal, abounding as it does in records of the merest trivialities, often induces the comparison of the diarist to Boswell; between whom and Pepys there is still this difference, that the latter was his own Johnson.

To those of our readers who may be disposed to view the character of Pepys, as developed in the volume under review, in a less favourable light than that in which we have regarded it, we would suggest the extenuation of his comparative youth; he not having attained the age of thirty at the period to which this portion of his journal conducts us.

In conclusion, we are bound to record our thanks to the noble editor for this most acceptable contribution to our literature. We shall look with eager interest to the appearance of the remaining portions of the diary; and, in the meantime, commend the volume already published to the attention of our readers. It is full of historical illustrations, quaint anecdote, and lively pictures of the society of the time; and if, regarded in a moral point of view, it abounds not in examples to guide—it is not wanting in beacons to warn.

ART. IX.—*The Statistical Companion.* Compiled by T. C. BANFIELD, Statistical Clerk to the Council of Education; and C. R. WELD, Assistant Secretary to the Royal Society. London: Longmans.

IN our last number we entered at some length into an examination of the theory of "*Direct* Taxation," and canvassed with considerable care the leading statements which had been made on this important subject, both in and out of Parliament; and we think we succeeded in showing that a *direct* property and income tax, imposed to an extent sufficient to bear on its shoulders the weight of all other taxes, is the wild chimera of visionary men, and, if ever attempted, would

prove impracticable. So convinced are we of its utter dissonancy to the fundamental principles of civil society that we hesitate not to say that, if all other taxes were abandoned, and a fixed tax on property and income substituted in their place, such an attempt would not only be at variance with the nature of things, but would speedily be followed by national bankruptcy and universal ruin as its legitimate consequences. The wealth of the empire would not dwindle away by slow and imperceptible degrees, but would be carried off as if by a revulsion of nature, and leave not a wreck behind; whilst the empire itself would sink down into the vortex which the shock had created, and be lost in the dark oblivion of the future. Of a truth, we need no such compulsive power. Free-trade speculations are daily conducting us to this catastrophe.

If, therefore, a *direct* tax on property and income is thus impracticable, and, if attempted, ruinous, to what sort of taxes, which, in their imposition, shall be less arbitrary, more productive, and more safe, shall we resort? We have endeavoured in the following pages to enquire into this important and interesting question; and we shall rejoice if, in the course of the enquiry, we shall be enabled to throw out one suggestion which shall assist in settling the theory of taxation on its just and lasting foundation.

A LAND TAX has been proposed by some writers as a fitting remedy for the difficulties of our present financial pressure; but a brief examination of this proposal will suffice to shew that it is liable to serious objections, and would eventually fall where its proposers would least of all desire it.

Now, there are three ways in which it would be possible to levy a tax on land. First:—It might be levied in proportion to the rent, and vary with every variation of it. In this case it would be manifestly a tax on income, and much more objectionable in its character than the income tax, on the ground of its injustice and inequality: for, in the income tax, these charges against it are founded on the fact of taxing every class of contributors to an equal amount of rating; but, in the case of a land tax of the description we are considering, the tax would be laid on one class only, to the exclusion of all others. The introduction of such a tax would violate nearly every canon on which the theory of taxation is based. It would be unequal, partial, arbitrary, and invasive of one portion of national productive capital.

Secondly:—Again, the tax might be levied in proportion to the quality of the land and the quantity of the produce. In

such case it would be an equal tax, so far as land was concerned; and, perhaps, not partial as it respected the community at large. But the payment of the tax would *wholly fall on the consumer*, inasmuch as the imposition would be laid *proportionably* to its fertility on all cultivated land. If, therefore, the least productive soils (which, in fact, regulate the price of corn) yielded a sufficient quantity to repay the profits of stock before the imposition of the tax, it is evident that, after the imposition, the cultivator must increase the price of his produce to meet the charge, otherwise his profits would fall below the average rate, and he would withdraw his capital in search of some more profitable employment—a necessary consequence of such a tax, should the farmer be prevented by any circumstances from charging it on his produce. The tax, therefore, will inevitably fall on the consumer; wages will certainly be affected; and the only question of moment to decide is, whether the increase of wages will be taken out of the profits of trade, or fall on the community generally. If wholly abstracted from profits it would undoubtedly be an *unjust* imposition, partial in its operation, and indirectly an arbitrary invasion of property. But our conviction is, that it would fall on the general consumption; and, in that case, one objection would be, that, affecting wages in the first instance, it would have a tendency to increase the price of all commodities throughout the kingdom. But another objection much more serious may be urged against it. It would act as a bounty to the importers of foreign corn and other produce; for, if you add, by means of a tax, four shillings per quarter to the cost of production at home, whilst the foreign produce is left unfettered, you commit an act of injustice upon your own cultivators; and the only way of remedying such an evil would be to impose an equal tax upon all imported corn—a method which would render this tax fair and equitable.

Thirdly:—A land tax might also be levied on all land indiscriminately, without reference to the quality of the soil or the quantity of the production. In this case also the tax would fall on the consumer; but its assessment would be attended by a peculiar circumstance, involving a violation of another important canon belonging to this branch of finance —viz., that it would abstract more from the capital of the people than would find its way into the public treasury. Nay, it would incidentally prove the means of enriching private individuals: for, suppose two farmers are cultivating, with equal outlay, land of different qualities. Now, let a land tax be imposed which shall amount to 50*l.* on the inferior land

producing five hundred quarters of grain, the farmer very properly would compensate himself by a charge of 2s. a quarter on the amount of his produce. The farmer of the superior soil, producing one thousand quarters, would also compensate himself by the same charge of 2s. a quarter: but he also receives 2s. a quarter on the remaining five hundred quarters, and actually gains 25*l.* by the imposition of the tax.

The present land tax which is assessed upon each district, according to a certain invariable canon, was imposed by the 4th William and Mary, and was unequal at the time of its first assessment. It is now still more unequal; and the Act of Parliament, passed with a view to its redemption, was surely one of the most audacious propositions ever made to any people, and the most arbitrary invasion of property ever attempted. The tax is, in all cases, paid by the landlord; but it may be doubtful whether, in lapse of time, it may not have become merged in the rent. In the former case, it is a tax on income partial and unjust; in the latter, it is a tax on corn and falls on the consumer, and disables the farmer from competing with the foreign producer. If foreign grain is to be admitted duty free, it is absolutely due to justice that all tax on land should be forthwith abolished.

The ASSESSED TAXES are decidedly a tax upon income; but, unlike the income tax, are neither inquisitorial nor partial, but press with equal fairness on all the contributors; but they offend against one important canon of taxation—viz., by diverting capital from its natural course, and restraining beneficial expenditure. Dr. Adam Smith is certainly under a mistake when he says of taxes of this description—"Though a part of revenue should be taken away, in order to defray the expenses of the State, no discouragement will thereby be given to any sort of industry." Our impression is far otherwise. If, through the pressure of these taxes, any considerable number of persons through the country should feel it necessary to lay down their carriages, horses, &c., who can tell the discouraging influence it would exercise on every "sort of industry?" Coachmakers, blacksmiths, sadlers, with the trades depending on them, would all be sufferers; whilst the means of employment to servants would be curtailed, and the Government, year by year, would receive diminishing supplies. No taxes react more immediately or more heavily than these taxes on income: they are, however, fair and equitable; and, if *moderately* levied, would be free from objection. It is their excess which renders them oppressive, and, in their reaction, injurious to the common prosperity.

The STAMP DUTIES, if properly adjusted, may also be considered as a fair and equitable tax, violating in as slight degree as any tax can the fundamental principles of taxation. The transference of property, under all circumstances, whether from the dead to the living, or from the hand of one proprietor to that of another, is a proper object of taxation, inasmuch as such transfers are made immediately under the protection and sanction of law; and it is just and reasonable that those persons who are in a condition to be enriched or benefitted by the transfer should make some acknowledgment to the State for a boon which thousands of their fellow-subjects are not capable of enjoying. We cannot, therefore, agree with Mr. Ricardo in his opinion on these taxes: he observes correctly enough—"It should be the policy of Governments to encourage a disposition to do this (increase their capital) in the people, and never to lay such taxes as will inevitably fall on capital; since, by so doing, they impair the funds for the maintenance of labour, and thereby diminish the future production of the country." We have already shown in what manner, and under what circumstances, this effect would be produced; but it is clear to demonstration that no such effect can be produced by taxes on the transference of capital. "If a legacy (he observes) of 1,000*l.* be subject to a tax of 100*l.*, the legatee considers his legacy as only 900*l.*, and feels no particular motive to save the 100*l.* duty from his expenditure, and thus the capital of the country is diminished; but if he had really received 1,000*l.*, and had been required to pay 100*l.* as a tax on income, on wine, on horses, or on servants, he would probably have diminished, or rather not increased, his expenditure by that sum, and the capital of the country would have been unimpaired" (Pol. Econ. p. 173).

It is at once apparent that the "capital" of the country cannot be "diminished" by the abstraction of the 100*l.* from the legacy, unless it can be shown that the 100*l.* has been annihilated or bestowed on the subjects of some foreign State: the capital even of the individual would not be diminished, for the 100*l.* had never become his property: besides, it is obvious, from this illustration, that the country is greatly benefitted by the transference of the 100*l.* to Government; for, according to Mr. Ricardo, the legatee, if an income tax had been levied on the whole amount of legacy, would probably have diminished his expenditure to that amount; whereas, the 100*l.*, finding its way at once into the public exchequer, it became material for useful expenditure. Suppose, for instance, the 100*l.* in question to have been paid by Government to a

judge, and that he, having no immediate call for expenditure, added it to his capital, is not his capital a part of the capital of the country, and as productive as the capital from whence the 100*l.* has been abstracted? But suppose the judge places the 100*l.* in the hands of his steward, who expends it in discharging the bills of the carpenter, coachmaker, &c., will it not become capital in their hands? The tax is, in fact, a beneficial distribution of *national* capital.

A similar mistake runs through the writings of Dr. Adam Smith; and, as he has been held up as the chief authority on all subjects connected with political economy, the error must have produced an injurious effect on the minds of our statesmen and philosophers. The following passage contains a monstrous perversion of truth, arising from this false view of the subject:—"All taxes upon the transference of property ..... are all more or less unthrifty taxes that increase the revenue of the sovereign, which seldom maintains any but unproductive labourers, at the expense of the people, which maintains none but productive." This is not the place for exposing the errors contained in this passage.

Our firm impression is that the stamp duties are capable of being made a useful and productive source of public revenue. It is, however, notorious that all these duties require a strict and careful revision: the tax on the transfer of land is exorbitant, and not only defeats its own purpose by diminishing the amount of the tax, but is a great impediment in the way of the transfer of land, and of that natural and easy flow of property from one individual to another, by which the reproduction of capital is so much facilitated; whilst a moderate, not a graduated, tax should be levied on the devise and succession of land. The only objection to this tax which we can discover is its somewhat inquisitorial power in the case of devised personal property. It not only searches into the private possession of the disconsolate living, but, what is altogether indefensible, exposes the affairs of the dead to the curiosity of the public. This is a grievance which ought to be prevented by every means at the disposal of Government. It must be extremely offensive to every sensitive mind to reflect that, in case of his death, the state of his monetary affairs will be published in every newspaper in the kingdom. We cannot too loudly protest against such an evil custom: it is an offence to the memory of the dead and an infliction on the sympathy of the living.

We shall next address ourselves to the consideration of taxes on WAGES—a tax which, if it could be levied directly,

would be a tax on income, of the most unjust and arbitrary description. Mr. Ricardo has devoted one whole chapter to the consideration of such a tax; but we are confident that no such tax could be attempted by any government, except the most ignorant and tyrannical; and, if attempted, the common sense and common justice of mankind would rise up to condemn it. We do not think, however, if wages could be directly taxed, that the whole payment would fall on the labourer. If the demand for labour continued the same, the tax would, in all probability, fall on the profits of trade, and would even thus be very partial and unjust in its operations. If wages are to be thus exposed to taxation, the tax must be levied either on land or directly on the productions of the soil. In either case, the tax will be followed by a rise of wages—perhaps not immediately, but gradually, and, of a certainty, so long as the demand for labour continues stationary—we speak of industrial wages, such as by competition are liable, in an advanced state of population, to be brought down to the natural level. On wages of this kind, we venture to say no tax can permanently rest, so far as the necessaries of life are concerned—an opinion in which we are supported by Dr. Adam Smith. "Whilst the demand for labour, therefore, and the price of provisions remain the same, a direct tax on the wages of labour can have no other effect than to raise them somewhat higher than the tax." Whether direct, therefore, or indirect, no tax can be sustained by the wages of labour; for, in the first case, it will fall on the profits of the employer, and, in the second, will be charged on the consumer. We repeat, therefore, when the price of labour has reached its natural level, or when the labourer's wages are only adequate to supply him with the necessaries of living, should any tax, such as a general land tax, which raises provisions, be imposed, his wages after the tax will be inadequate to afford him that supply. Wages must, therefore, rise.

It is, undoubtedly true that in times of scarcity, the industrial classes will have to bear their share of suffering with the rest of the community; for, under the circumstances of a diminished supply, nature inculcates upon us the necessity of a diminished consumption, which can only be effected by diminishing, among all classes of consumers, the power to purchase. Wages will not, therefore, rise in consequence of a deficient supply; otherwise, consumption would not be diminished, the purposes of nature would be counteracted, and the evils attendant on scarcity aggravated. Hence, a tax on the foreign importation of corn did not act injuriously either on wages or

profits. It could not raise the price of corn: it would, and did, protect the home growth, so that the capital invested in land did not fall below the average rate of profit—a matter of great importance to the public; for if the capital invested in the cultivation of land should fail to realize its just profit, it will, as we have already said, be withdrawn, to seek other and more profitable channels of employment—a result which might be attended with the most disastrous consequences. Rent was not in the least affected by it. The tax on the importation of corn was paid by the foreigner; and that was the worst evil attending it. But we must not digress.

There are, however, other commodities which, although they are not absolutely catalogued amongst the necessaries of life, yet enter necessarily into the expenditure of wages. Sugar, tea, coffee, soap, candles, &c., are of this description; and although, as in the former case, these taxes are reckoned by the manufacturer in the cost of production, and charged by him on the sale of his commodities; yet, when competition runs high, labour is abundant, or demand sluggish in any branch of manufacture, the manufacturer will be precluded from making his usual charges on the consumers, and will endeavour to protect his profits by laying this portion of expenditure upon the wages of his workmen: hence the reduction of wages and the consequent poverty existing at this moment in various branches of trade. There can, therefore, be no doubt but that, if the amount of taxation raised on these articles could be collected in some other way, the change would be a great relief, in times of difficulty, both to capital and wages.

There are, however, certain commodities, such as tobacco, spirits, &c., which must fall directly upon wages, and for which there can be no remedy, inasmuch as there is no law or principle in human affairs which can render it incumbent on the employer to meet such expenses incurred by his workmen; nor is there any friend to his fellow man who would wish to see articles of a pernicious nature placed, too easily, within the reach of the industrial classes. No person can doubt that if ardent spirits of every description were placed beyond the reach of all classes, except as a medicine, it would be a boon to society, and act beneficially on the moral and physical powers of man.

We have yet one other subject to consider in taxes on RAW PRODUCE. If it be admitted that no tax should be levied on those means of living which affect the industrial classes of

society, we must, at once, discard all those taxes which affect the productions of the earth absolutely necessary to their wholesome subsistence, and those, too, which are reasonably necessary to their comfort and happiness; because, although we think the labourer, generally, would regain the greater portion of the tax from increased wages, yet it would be by slow degrees, and then not always to the full extent of his just expectation; whilst, in certain circumstances, he would be crushed under the imposition. Society has a great debt of justice to pay to the artizans and labourers of this country.

But we entertain a very different opinion as it respects many other productions of the earth. Look at the mineral kingdom. Might not a tax be fairly and justly levied on all its productions with the greatest advantage to the whole community? These productions are very numerous—iron, lead, tin, copper, stone, slate, &c., being a great source of national wealth, nor can any rational objection be made to their taxation. We should not levy the tax on the ore or raw production, because such an assessment would not only be attended with difficulty but might react upon wages and create confusion; but we would impose the tax on the metals when they had passed through several gradations of workmanship, and were brought to that state in which they are generally sold for the purpose of manufacture. We should not levy the tax on the ton weight of metal, but *ad valorem* on the pound sterling. Thus a tax of two and a half per cent. on the finished production, and at the period when it leaves the foundry for immediate consumption, is the most fitting moment for ascertaining the amount of tax; nor would such a tax affect the miner or founder in the slightest degree, if care were taken in the collection of the tax. Manifestly the miner would have nothing to do with it; and, in the case of the founder, from whose hands it passes to the public, if he received a *permit* recognising the sale, from the nearest stamp office, making the tax payable at three months, no profit on the advance of the tax need then be charged to the consumer. It is clear that such a tax would press equally on all classes of the community, and in proportion to their abilities to bear it. The rich consumer who spends 20*l.* a-year in iron manufacture would pay 10s.; the poor man who spends 6s. a-year would pay sixpence; and, so far should we be from granting drawbacks on exportation, that we should be inclined to raise it to £5 per cent. In our opinion not one ton less would be sold, nor one farthing less profit received by the British exporter; and it is but

right and honourable that we should avail ourselves of the peculiar advantages of our own native productions.

The bill of exchangeable value would stand thus:—

Cost of production at the mine per ton	£2	10	0
Cost at the foundry	2	0	0
Cost of taxation at two and a half per cent. . .		2	3
	£4	12	3

These prices are hypothetical; but the statement is simply to show how the founder would make his charge on the public: he would as soon think of paying the charge of the miner out of his profits as he would the amount of the tax. It would not in the slightest degree affect his profits, but would be paid by the consumer, as it justly ought. After subjecting the whole mineral kingdom to a similar assessment, we should extend this scheme of taxation to the animal kingdom:—

British wool costs in the raw material . . . .
Costs of Spinning. . . . . .
Dying . . . . . .
Weaving . . . . . .
Taxation . . . . . .
Profit . . . . . .

Now, what could press more equally on all classes of the community than such a tax as this? A superior cloth at 20s. a-yard would yield twice the amount of tax to an inferior cloth at 10s. Thus the rich consumer would not only pay a greater amount of tax on the superior quality of his cloth, but on the greater quantity which he would consume.

We should next invade the vegetable world, and cause its various and important products to contribute to the public revenue, and consequently to the national advantage:—

Raw material of Flax and Hemp costs . . . . .
Cost of preparing, &c.. . . . . .
Cost of Weaving. . . . . .
Cost of tax on linen, sails, cords, &c. at 2½ per cent.
Profit . . . . . .

Price to the consumer . . . .

With respect to the raw produce of silk and cotton, which are not of British production, it appears but just and reasonable that a similar tax should be levied on the home consumption, much more on the fabrics intended for exportation. Drawbacks are the greatest frauds ever practised upon a deluded

nation. By such absurd regulations you plunder your own people, delude the foreign purchaser, and give unjust and enormous profits to speculating merchants. By such a tax as we have proposed, silks at the value of 2s. 6d a-yard would bear a tax of about ½d. a-yard, whilst, on cottons at 7½d., the tax would be about half a farthing, and at 3d., not a fourth of a farthing. No reasonable man can suppose that such a tax could be injurious to foreign trade: on the contrary, we think a higher tax on exportation might safely be levied. Depend upon it, the merchant would repay himself, and the foreigner would be made, justly, to contribute towards the support of those advantages of British capital and material which he so largely shares.

We have now only to remark that all commodities of foreign importation should be free, provided no further taxes are required for the public revenue: and amongst these, we may enumerate tea, coffee, sugar, and other articles which enter largely into the people's consumption; but, decidedly, a tax should be laid on their exportation. The reason is obvious. Taxes on the importation of foreign manufactured goods, which enter into competition with home manufacture, ought to be levied, at all events, to the amount of taxation laid on the home production, with an increased tax on exportation; otherwise the home consumer pays an additional price on the exported article, inasmuch as it lessens the home supply, evades the competition of the home markets, and seeks for profit elsewhere.

It must be borne in mind that these observations are made on the supposition that all taxes which enter into the consumption of wages are abandoned. We are deeply convinced that a thorough investigation of the taxation of the country is at this moment required: we further think that it is capable of great improvement; and that, by careful management and an equal distribution, it might be made abundantly productive for all the purposes of public expenditure, and so arranged as to be borne cheerfully by a prosperous and grateful people.

Since writing the above a small pamphlet has been placed in our hands, in the form of a letter to R. Cobden, Esq., M.P., and signed "J. Hyde," and which we have read with attention. The writer is a man in earnest, and has had considerable opportunities, through a long experience, of observing the workings of the fiscal system of the country among the middle and lower classes of society. At the present crisis every individual who can offer practical illustrations on this important matter, of which he has made himself master by

personal observation, affords the most valuable materials for the investigation of the economist and is a benefactor to his country. But the writer of this tract goes far beyond this. We admit that he has manifested some practical knowledge of the subject; but he has startled us by the assumption of a grand principle without informing us of the steps by which he has arrived at it. He has made himself master of the city without drawing his lines, erecting his batteries, or attempting to effect a breach. He has, indeed, achieved his purpose; but it has been in the dark. Now, for aught we know, this may be the best mode of taking a city; but, in matters of inductive science, where every point must be reached by a long and patient investigation and induction of particulars, such an overleaping of barriers and jumping to conclusions are inadmissible. The writer in question *assumes* that "the only legitimate foundation of taxation is property." Now, we might admit at once that *property* is the only *foundation* for *taxation,* inasmuch as without *property* there could be no society to tax. Property is every thing to society—it is the support of labour, the spur to industry, the incentive to genius, and the source of wealth—hence, therefore, and of necessity, the "foundation" of taxation. Had the writer of the letter to Mr. Cobden carried out this harmless self-evident proposition, his incubations might have been of singular service to the community; but he has done far otherwise. He has not made *property* the *foundation* of taxation, but the subject of it: he has not built his fiscal superstructure upon this broad and durable basis; but he has set himself to work to destroy it. If it be a solid foundation, do not weaken its stability: if it do afford a basis sufficiently broad and expansive for the superabundant weight, do not narrow its limits and render it unfit for its grand purpose. We admit that property, in some way or other, must be made the subject of taxation. If it be a foundation, leave it in all its solidity: if it be a stately oak, do not hack its roots: if it be a mighty river, do not divert its course. In the one case, build upon it, if you please, and make use of its lofty chambers: in the other, gather your fruit from its branches: or, in the third, draw your happiness from its never-failing streams. But guard the foundations of your polity with a watchful eye—in other words, let property be sacred. In the mass let it be protected, and it will inevitably form the ground-work of national prosperity: but if you interfere with its sources—if you prevent its expansion —if you divert it from its natural channel—you will weaken

the springs of labour, exhaust the powers of industry, and hasten the national decay.

In our opinion the writer of this unpretending *brochure* has not well considered the question. He has not examined it on every side, and looked at it again and again from every point of view he could command; but has rashly seized upon a conclusion which he ought to have arrived at by a slow and painstaking investigation. He has thus laid down a system of taxation at once arbitrary and impracticable, which, if attempted, would be speedily followed by the most disastrous consequences. Why, for instance, is property in land to be taxed at a higher rate than any other property? On account of its "durability?" Can this be a just ground of distinction? Is it more durable than property in gold and silver? Or, if it should be considered more durable than property in houses, is it to be doubted that the investment has been more valuable? If land be more durable than houses, no doubt it cost more. But the fact is, there is no distinction to be drawn—at least, no legitimate distinction—between the different kinds of property. Property invested in land, or houses, or machinery, or stock in trade, *is* property, and the tax imposer has no right to make any distinction. All he has to do with is the existence of property and its *bonâ fide* value. Our author, therefore, has been guilty of an assumption which he has not proved nor even attempted to prove, and of a distinction which can have no existence in fact; and which is, therefore, arbitrary and unjust, and which, if carried out by enactment, would be oppressive to individuals and injurious to the community.

Nor has the writer been sufficiently careful in his use of language. No man can ever be a safe guide who commits himself by making statements which will not bear to be examined. In speaking of the excise duties, as a departure from the principle of a tax on property, he says that "the miser with his tens of thousands may escape them." Now, it may be true that the miser may not choose to build houses; and, consequently, will require no bricks. He may be too penurious to buy hops, or malt, or even soap; but where are his "tens of thousands?" Are they also buying no bricks, purchasing no malt, or using no soap? It is evident the case of the miser is mere declamation. Again: he asserts that "the *peasant* pays (the excise duties) in a far greater ratio than the *prince*." Now, this is liable to the same interpretation: it is clap-trap reasoning. According to this, the peasant builds as many houses as the prince, purchases as many hops, consumes

as much malt, writes as many letters, employs as many post-horses, consumes as much soap and as many pounds of sugar. Personally, no doubt, the peasant might drink more ale, require more soap, and consume as much sugar; but the subject is rich in absurdity; and it is, to say the least of it, discreditable in any man who undertakes to write on grave and vastly important subjects, in which the national weal or woe are discussed, to permit himself to write in a style more suited for the hustings than for a grave and elaborate treatise. PROPERTY, then, is to be tenderly handled, and carefully guarded, and judiciously directed; and TAXATION must not come down upon it, like some infernal monster, and seize it with giant strength and break it on the ponderous wheel of society; but taxation must transform itself into a wise and skilful architect, making the best use of the *material* provided to his hands, adapting it as circumstances will allow, and extending his plans as opportunities shall offer; or as a gardener, securing the parent tree from injury, nourishing its roots, and enriching himself from its loaded branches; or as the agriculturist, directing the fertilising stream through his extensive meadows, not with the intention of weakening its supply, but with the design of continuing for ever. Thus must taxation act upon property; and he will be the best friend of his country who points out the readiest and safest methods of accomplishing it.

ART. XI.—*Ireland and the Channel Islands; or a Remedy for Ireland.* By CHARLES LE QUESNE, Esq. London: 1848. Longman.

A WITTY friend of ours, on being solicited a few days since to take a ticket for an anniversary dinner, excused himself on the plea that the general *bouleversement* of dynasties had made sovereigns so scarce, that he could not find one for the purpose. In whatever direction we turn we see nothing but confusion and perplexity. The King of the French, "afraid where no fear was," abandons his throne and scampers off in most unkingly haste, followed in the race by his sons, with a speed more creditable to their agility than their courage. After a vain and sufficiently ridiculous attempt at government by a junta of novelists, philosophers (such as they were), and poets (by courtesy), confusion became worse confounded; and what is France now but a fine field for a bold adventurer?

Indeed, we are half tempted ourselves to get up an *emeute* in Paris, with a view of re-establishing the monarchy in our own person; feeling that we should have as good a chance of the crown as Louis Buonaparte or the Count of Paris, and certainly as good a right to it as either. As for the Duke of Bordeaux, if he be open to a compromise, he would not find us exorbitant in our expectations, or illiberal in our consideration of his vested rights.

The King of Prussia is next taught that he is only the viceroy of King Mob; and, after having been snubbed by his subjects, he turns his prowess on the comparatively defenceless Danes, on the same principle (to borrow a happy illustration from a clever friend) that a man, who has been kicked in the street, goes home and beats his wife to recover his self-esteem.

Austria—the most conservative, or, as others may term her, the most absolute, of all the nations of Europe—whose government had so far the character of a paternal one that all her subjects were treated as children—Austria has been well thrashed by her Italian dependencies, which, not six months since, scarcely dared call their souls their own. Imperial Ferdinand, no longer backed by his old Minister, joins in the royal race and escapes to Innspruck; whence, however, he will probably be coaxed back to Vienna, there to await the decision of the diet at Frankfort as to the position he is hereafter to occupy in the German Confederation.

Spain—for years past mis-governed, or rather not governed at all—on a sudden stands upon her dignity; and, impatient of a gratuitous and not over complimentary lecture from the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, quarrels with her old ally, puts Cuba in a state of defence, and is doubtless at this moment contemplating the recapturing of Gibraltar or the fitting out of another Armada. It were to be wished that Spanish honour was as sensitive in pecuniary matters as it is in political ones.

Things have not arrived at quite so desperate a pass in old England. Some blows have been struck, it is true; but they have alighted chiefly on the polls of policemen and special constables—their assailants generally not stopping to receive an equivalent in kind. Briefless barristers have waxed fierce, and tailors truculent; but the red flag of republicanism is not yet streaming from one of the inverted turnip-radishes which so multitudinously decorate the roof of the house of the Imperial Parliament; nor is Mrs. Cuffy, as wife of the first consul, holding drawing-rooms at Buckingham-palace.

But the felicity thus enjoyed—a felicity constituted by the absence of a provisional government and mob-law—is not without the alloy which qualifies all human enjoyments. England has a thorn in her side in the shape of what is called, facetiously, the *Sister* Island. Not that we deny the existence of a sisterly feeling; but, like the Irishman's reciprocity, it is "all on one side." Sister England has found the relationship disagreeable and inconvenient enough; but she has never repudiated it. Time was when Sister Ireland suffered grievously during a hard winter and a scarcity of food! Sister England practically acknowledged the relationship; and, to adopt a familiar and not very classical phrase, "came down handsomely" on the occasion. Some very poetical compliments — the green isle is the land of poetry — were "shipped" in return for the liberal largesse of Sister England, and this was all—though more than she desired—that the latter reaped by the transaction.

Years passed on, during which Sister Ireland, to shew her gratitude for past favours, engaged an orator to abuse Sister England, paying him for his vituperation in a coin called "*rint*," in the Erse language—Erse or Gaelic, we know not which (we confess our ignorance): it may be either or both; or they may be convertible terms. Well, no word in the English or Irish vocabulary was too bad for England. She was bloody and brutal; and, in fact, everything base which is included in the comprehensive term of vituperation—"Saxon;" and Sister Ireland more than insinuated that Sister England, as regarded a virtue generally cherished and especially characteristic of the sex, was no better than she should be.

An interval of years elapsed, when there came another hard winter and a sharp famine; and Sister Ireland, not being of a taciturn temper, very soon made known her wants. Sister England—as is natural even with sisters on such occasions—could not but cast an eye on the past; nor could she help thinking, if she did not say, "Well, really, Sister Ireland has not behaved quite as she ought, and must have a marvellously short memory; or, after what has passed, she could scarcely have had the face to apply to me again. However—though I wish she had been any other person's sister than mine, and though I owe my butcher and my baker a great deal more than I am likely to pay—she is still my sister; and, though my purse is lank, my credit is good; so I will take in a loaf and a joint or two extra a-week, and send it over to Sister Ireland with my best love."

Well, Sister Ireland took the loaf and the legs of mutton,

and grumbled—in the most poetical language we admit; but Sister England was a very matter-of-fact sort of person, and, when she had winnowed out the chaff of poetry from her sister's gratitude, was not over well pleased with the residuum of prose. However, as Sister England did not care for fine words, and never looked for a return in any other shape, she adopted a proverb of another sister—a very respectable and well-behaved person—"Let by-ganes be by-ganes," and thought no more of the matter.

Now, in most quarrels, and in family ones especially, there are faults on both sides; and it is contended by the apologists of Sister Ireland that there are not a few faults on the side of Sister England; and, moreover, that the former would never have been so bitter towards the latter had it not been for some pretended friends of Sister Ireland, who, for their own selfish and sordid views, did all they could to poison her mind against her sister, and thus perpetuate the feud between them. But it is time that we revert to the matter in hand.

The second title of the book, "A Remedy for Ireland," is enough to challenge our attention; and the manifest sincerity and single-mindedness with which the author propounds his views command for them our fullest consideration. An extract from the preface will at once explain the author's object:—

"Living and born in an island which has been particularly favoured by Providence, which is blessed with a happy and contented population, with free institutions, and under the paternal government of the British Crown, I have been led to contrast the different appearance which Ireland exhibits, although a fertile country and a portion of the British empire. It has appeared to me that one of the chief causes of that contrast is to be found in the different and opposite systems which have been followed in the two with regard to the appropriation and the tenure of land. I have observed that in Ireland landed property has at various times undergone great and violent changes, and that the land is now divided among a few proprietors, while the bulk of the population, dependent upon the land for support, yet possessing no part of it, are in a state of great destitution and suffering. In the Channel Islands land is divided among small proprietors, and the population is contented and happy. The same principle may be observed in operation in other countries. We find that where the peasantry are land proprietors, industry and its attendant blessings are widely spread. I have been led to the conclusion that the adoption in Ireland of the landed system which has existed in the Channel Islands for centuries would be the great panacea for many, if not most, of the woes of that unfortunate country."

A considerable portion of the early part of the volume is

devoted to a brief view of the history of Ireland, from Henry II. to the present period: but it is with the present that we have now particularly to deal; and it will be our object rather to possess the reader with the scope and nature of the author's plan, than to propound our own opinions on the *questio vexata* of Irish affairs.

We cannot, however, help adverting to not the least important element of the misery which afflicts Ireland. We have reason to know that the picture given in the following extract is but too faithful:—

"The example set by the upper classes of society naturally exerts a certain influence on the other classes. If extravagance and thoughtlessness are the characteristics of the former, we may expect to find them more or less general, particularly if circumstances favour their diffusion. This is more particularly the case in Ireland, where the power of accumulation was withdrawn from the people—where there exists generally a great kindness of feeling and respect for a gentleman—and where the manners of the gentry are especially regarded with a desire towards their imitation. It is a remarkable circumstance that the Irishman, in the midst of rags and poverty, will ape the appearance of a gentleman. He will not wear a jacket, though the most appropriate for work: he must have a body-coat, as a gentleman, though it be in tatters, and the most unfit and inconvenient for labour. He will not wear a cap, but must have a hat, as a gentleman, though the crown long since has taken its departure, or is on the eve of doing so. The labouring population are improvident and thoughtless—the example, alas! they have had has not taught or led them better. Had it been otherwise—had the landlords lived on their own lands and improved them—had they paid every proper attention to the state of their tenantry—had they set them a good example and encouraged them both by personal superintendence and by an equitable system of letting farms—we should have beheld a better state of things in Ireland. Sad have been the consequences—sad the influence of the improvidence of many—ay, very many, of the landlords of that unfortunate and unhappy country!"

Our author lays much stress on absenteeism as a cause of the miseries of the Irish tenantry. Property, doubtless, has responsibilities as well as privileges; and we consider that the landlord has a duty of which to acquit himself to the tenant in a variety of ways, especially in taking care that the latter is not over-rented—that he is not so ground down that he cannot make a fair profit out of the land. The landlord ought to take a practical interest in the comfort of every individual who lives upon his estate, which, in fact, he holds in trust for that purpose. He has no right entirely to depute this duty to stewards or agents, however humane and trust-

worthy, if it be in his power, as it is in the majority of instances, to give a portion of his own time to the task. Let him have as many deputies as he pleases, but he ought, if possible, to superintend them. In Ireland, where the system of middlemen and subletting prevails to such an extent, this duty on the part of the lords of the soil is obviously the more imperative. We admit, in many instances, that there is much difficulty, and in others not a little danger, in such superintendence: nor is a man likely to enter upon the task with much alacrity when, with the best intentions and the most strenuous endeavours to promote the welfare of his tenantry and dependents, he cannot walk across his own lawn without being shot at. Some instances of this kind are within our personal knowledge: others are unhappily matters of notoriety—witness the cases of Major Mahon and Mr. Lloyd.

The duty, however, to which we refer is frequently performed, and that nobly, by some of the landowners of Ireland. Take an example:—

"The good that can be effected by a landlord, who will devote his time and attention to the improvement of his estate and of the condition of the people—who will be patient and persevering in his efforts—who will not be discouraged by the opposition, apathy, and ignorance of the farmers and cottiers—is beautifully illustrated in the case of Lord George Hill, who, by his persevering endeavours and decided conduct, has quite changed the appearance of a large tract near Gweedore, and raised the people from a state continually bordering on famine to one of comparative comfort. If landlords generally were to be influenced by his example, as some in various parts of Ireland are—if they would apply capital to the land, look after their tenants, teach them a proper mode of cultivation by example and persuasion, endeavour to raise their social condition by every means in their power—they would not only improve the value of their own property and thereby benefit themselves, but would raise Ireland in the scale of civilisation, and diffuse comfort and happiness around, and be blessed in the consideration and assurance that their names would be engraved in the hearts of the people, and would long be remembered after they themselves were gathered unto their fathers. I do not believe there can be a more pleasing reflection than that of having done our duty to the best of our ability—to the utmost of our power—in the sphere in which it has pleased Providence to place us, and according to the opportunities which have been conceded to us. Property, in the highest sense, is a trust confided to us; and we are certainly accountable for the manner in which we exercise it: and, although the law cannot deprive a man of his property, if he does not therewith assist in bettering the condition of those who are more or less dependent upon him as tenants on landlords in Ireland, still it should encourage the tendency, and indirectly, and by gradual means, attain the results so desirable of

a general improvement in the condition of the people. In order that all the advantages of wealth should be attained, it is necessary that it be diffused—not by any improper or violent means, but by the spread of industry, and by the placing of the people in a position to attain to it and profit by it."

We have quoted the entire paragraph as, independently of the fact which, to the honour of Lord George Hill, it records, it is replete with good sense and right feeling.

The remedy for the existing evils of Ireland on which Mr. Le Quesne relies is the giving the small cultivator a greater interest in the soil he tills; and, by way of illustration of its advantages, the author institutes a comparison between the agricultural conditions of Ulster and Connaught:—

"It is very remarkable that the average magnitude of the farms in Ulster and Connaught, the richest and the poorest provinces, is about one-half that of the farms in Leinster and Munster. We should scarcely have imagined that the average would have been very nearly the same in the northern and western provinces; and the question thence arises, how is it that the condition of the people in these two provinces is so very different? I am aware that many persons will seek for a solution in the different character of the people; but may we not with great reason seek for it in the different conditions in the tenure of the land? The tenant in Ulster has a kind of joint proprietorship with the landlord, and therefore improves his farm, makes the most of it, feels an interest in so doing, and raises his condition in life. In Connaught the tenant feels no inducement to improve, believing that his rent would be raised accordingly, and that he would derive no advantage from his improvement, and he therefore rests satisfied with his low and degraded condition. To my mind, this circumstance affords a strong corroborative evidence of the value of the possession of land; for although the tenant in Ulster is not really the possessor of the land he tills, yet, in a limited sense, he acts and feels as though he were; and were he actually and legally so, the general advantages resulting would be still greater; and I am perfectly persuaded that the great evil of Ireland is its small number of land proprietors. The face of the country—the condition of the people—would materially improve, were the land divided among a greater number of proprietors. The sub-division of farms has been allowed to go on, while a division of property has not taken place. Had a different system been pursued, there would now be a middle class of land proprietors in Ireland, and the sub-division of estates would have acted as a check to the sub-division of farms; but, at present, what is the appearance of Ireland? Thus writes an intelligent foreigner, M. Kohl:—'The vast extent of most of the estates in Ireland offers a melancholy contrast to the minuteness of some of the farms, or rather potato grounds. There is no country in Europe where the actual cultivators of the soil have so little property in the land they cultivate as in Ireland. In Russia there are large estates, but the holdings of the peasants are large too. In Ire-

land there are single estates more extensive than German principalities, with farms (if such an expression can be applied) not larger than the bit of ground which an English gentleman would set aside for his rabbits in a corner of his park.' "

It is delightful to turn from pictures of agrarian wretchedness, such as abound in this volume, to the following sketch, borrowed by our author from M. Khol, of an Irish oasis:—

" 'The county of Wexford (says he) is one of the districts of Ireland that has many claims upon the attention of a stranger. From the official returns, it would appear to be the county in which public morality stood highest, for it is that in which the fewest crimes occur; and I found, in looking over the returns, that although the murders for all Ireland ranged between 160 and 300, yet there were frequently years in which no crime of the kind was committed in the county of Wexford. The people of Wexford I found, moreover, considered themselves much more intelligent and enlightened than their countrymen in the west; and the barony of Forth, or south-eastern peninsula, cut off from the rest of the country by the hills of Forth, is said to contain the most orderly people in Ireland. It was originally a Welsh colony, planted by Strongbow, and during seven centuries these colonists have kept themselves apart from the rest of the population. They still marry only among themselves; and, in the last century, they still understood Welsh. The most remarkable characteristic of the barony, however, is that it contains no beggars. It is as difficult in Ireland to imagine a district without beggars as in other countries to believe in the existence of a whole nation of them. In short, the barony of Forth is to the county of Wexford what the latter is to Ireland. In Wexford the land is divided into a number of small estates, instead of being concentrated in a few hands. There are no large proprietors, but all the more persons of moderate wealth, and absenteeism is almost unknown. All this prevails to a still greater extent in the barony of Forth, where the peasants are generally the owners of the soil they till, dwell in clean and orderly houses, and seem to feel that rags are, at all events, a deformity. Their cottages are surrounded by flower-gardens—they mingle not in political squabbles by which the rest of Ireland is kept in hot water—and Protestants and Catholics dwell among them in peace and goodwill. In a word, the barony of Forth presents a moral picture that naturally awakens the enquiry, "And why is it not so even throughout Ireland?" ' And, indeed, we may repeat the enquiry, 'Why is it not so?' Let the attempt, however, be made so far as it can: let the barony of Forth, such as it is here described, be our pattern, and let us hope that Ireland will one day present as beautiful an appearance!"

Mr. Le Quesne refers to a company in progress of formation, called "The Farmer's Estate Society for Ireland," as being a step in the right direction. Its object is thus explained:—

" The basis of this Society appears to be on the acknowledgment of three important facts—that small portions of land are seldom brought

into the market for sale—that several persons would be desirous of purchasing such, but have not sufficient capital to pay the whole of the purchase-money, together with the expenses required for the necessary outlay on the land. The object of the Society, therefore, is to assist in the purchase, as will appear from the following extract from their prospectus:—'The Farmers' Estate Society propose purchasing eligible estates in fee as they come into the market, and selling them afterwards in small lots of not less than forty statute acres, the preference being given to the tenant in possession, if unobjectionable in other respects, and the purchase-money taken in half-yearly payments. The purchase-money being thus taken by instalments, the purchaser can expend any capital he possesses in the cultivation of the land, erecting buildings, and making other improvements; and as he improves he will be the better enabled to pay larger instalments until the purchase shall be completed—a system materially different from the present, under which the farmer generally gives all he possesses to get possession of a farm, and has no capital left for cultivation or stocking.'"

The author also refers to the plan propounded by Mr. Poulett Scrope as one of great promise:—

"The measure advocated by Mr. Scrope, M.P., has the same end in view; and, if acted upon, would be productive of considerable benefit. The main principle of his proposed measure is, that the Board of Works should be empowered to purchase at their present value any portions of the waste lands of Ireland (in the same manner as a railway company takes the lands it requires for its purposes), in any or every part of Ireland, wherever they should think fit, and to set to work to drain and commence the reclamation of such lands—funds being advanced by the Treasury—that as fast as any such lands became fitted for cultivation they should be divided into moderate-sized farms, houses built on them, and either sold outright, or leased for perpetuity at a quit-rent, with the option to the occupier of purchase at any time, or by instalments, under strict covenants not to subdivide or sublet."

Such of our readers who may not be familiar with the agricultural condition of the Channel Islands we must refer to Mr. Le Quesne's book, in which they will find it fully explained. We should be right glad to see the condition of Ireland assimilated to that of any happier country; but, although agreeing in the main with our author's theory, we do not see how it can be carried out without legislative enactments of a very arbitrary kind. The plan advocated by Mr. Le Quesne is, doubtless, calculated to abate, if not to remedy the evil; but it must, for the most part, be left in the hands and to the discretion of the large landed proprietors to apply it; and, if they could be made to see that their own interests are, or ought to be, identical with those of their tenants, there would be every hope of a change for the better.

In a political point of view, matters wear a more cheerful aspect than at the commencement of the present year. Altar denunciations have been silenced; for which, we suppose, we are mainly indebted to the rescript of Pope Pius IX.—partly, perhaps, to the spirited example of remonstrance set by the young Earl of Arundel and Surrey, whose exertions in the cause of order on this side of the channel are equally honourable to his good sense and manly feeling. Recent events have proved that the real disturbers of Ireland, the pike and vitriol-men, are comparatively few and wo'n't fight. We must not omit here to record our admiration of the temperate firmness of the Earl of Clarendon, whose conduct, at a crisis of great delicacy and danger, is beyond all praise.

And now a word or two in conclusion of an article which, it may be, some of our readers may consider to be rather a discursive treatise on "things in general," than as addressed immediately to the point. We are not Chartists, nor Radicals, nor Whigs—not even Conservatives; for Conservatism is but a bridge upon which the Whig and the Tory have shaken hands, half way. We suspect, indeed, that, if our heart were very deeply probed, somewhat—not a little perhaps—of the old Tory might be found at the bottom of it. But if, thanks to an almighty and all-merciful God, we are safe from the tempest which is tossing into wrecks the nations around us, we have duties to perform as well as subjects on which to congratulate ourselves. We have vindicated the law both in this country and in the "sister kingdom"—we have proved that in each there is the power, as well as the good sense and love of order, to resist and to put down any attempt at revolutionising the present condition of things; and, therefore, we can do gracefully what we are called upon to do imperatively—namely, to remedy, as far as human wisdom can do, all existing abuses. We are not of the wild school of enthusiasts who indulge the dream that human happiness can be accomplished by what is called "equality." We once heard an officer of the British navy illustrate this popular doctrine in a few words, which are worth any volume on political economy with which it has ever been our fortune to meet:—"Pay every man of the ship's crew a crown piece down upon the capstan head, and, at the end of a month, you will find one man with ten shillings in his pocket and another without a farthing." But "we have the poor always with us." We are assured, on the highest authority, that "the poor shall never cease from the land." It is our duty as a nation, as well as individuals, to make that state of suffering as endurable as may be. We are told that

we have "Poor Laws," and that no man need starve; but they *do* starve. We can scarcely take up a newspaper without reading an instance of the fact, and *one* instance is enough for our argument; and this, too, while thousands of men are riding in their carriages and rolling in wealth. Now, if the evil were met as it ought to be, we should hear nothing more of annual Parliaments, vote by ballot, and universal suffrage. The suffrage is universal enough: the British Parliament, in its worst-days of Tory corruption, as it is called, was not a whit less independent, and assuredly not less respectable, than the House of Commons is at this moment. The true and only remedy for existing *real* grievances is contained in a sentence—"Tax the luxuries of the rich in proportion to the necessities of the poor"—we mean, of course, of the poor who are willing to work, but have not the work to do. We do not mean to say that such a means of meeting the exigency should be applied exclusively to the sustenance of the needy at home. Let a portion of it be devoted to encouraging emigration as it ought to be encouraged—that is, not by merely providing a passage for able-bodied artizans and labourers to one of our colonies; but taking care that, in the colony selected, the demand for labour is not likely to fall short of the supply. With regard to poor rates, doubtless they press heavily enough—too heavily—on the agriculturist; and there is no reason and no necessity, as far as we can see, that his burdens should be increased. But what would it signify to us, individually (and there are thousands in our position in life, albeit a not very exalted one), if we paid twice the amount which we are now called upon to contribute in the shape of poor-rate.

We venture to press these considerations upon the attention of those in whose hands is the remedy—we mean, of course, on the government of the country and the nation at large. "Affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground." It is not beneath human hands that institutions and dynasties crumble into dust: let us, therefore, look to these things, lest we provoke the Lord to withdraw the protecting hand which has been so long stretched out over us; and but for which we, like other nations of Europe, might at this moment hold our liberty and even our lives at the mercy of a mob.

ART. XI.—1. *The Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies of Holy Scripture: with Notes, and an Outline of the Various Interpretations.* By the Rev. W. H. HOARE, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge. London: Parker. 1848.

2. *The Great Continental Revolution, marking the Expiration of the Times of the Gentiles,* A.D. 1847-8. By JAMES HATLEY FRERE, ESQ. Hatchard. 1848.

EVENTS are still pressing onward to a crisis with an aspect which is both bewildering in the rapidity of its course and startling in the unexpected features which glare upon us, from day to day, as the scene flits before our astonished gaze. We cannot but notice these events, but it is under the impression that the events are in the hand of God, and therefore unknown to man; and that, before the lines which we are now writing shall issue from the press, some new turn of affairs may so change the aspect of all things as to render obsolete and inapplicable all our present conjectures, which have only past experience for their basis, and the ordinary calculations of human sagacity to direct them and test their truth. More and more are we made to feel the force of the admonition, "l'homme propose, mais Dieu dispose."

But because it is so—because the issues are in the hand of God and all the steps and stages are under his controul—therefore the general results have been declared beforehand in the word of God in such terms as to serve for warning and instruction to the Church, and to prove that God has foreseen and overruled all things; yet not so expressly declared as to tempt man to interfere with the counsels of God, by endeavouring with the puny arm of flesh to accelerate or frustrate the purposes of the Almighty. "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him? Let them bring forth, and show us what shall happen: let them show the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them, or declare us things for to come."

The prophecies of the Old Testament constituted a perpetual code of admonition for the Jews, showing them, during the whole Mosaic dispensation, what would be the consequences of transgressing the law and breaking the commandments which he had given from Mount Sinai; and how, notwithstanding their sin against him, he would still accomplish

to the very letter the promises which he had made to Abraham, the father of the faithful, and to David, the chosen king; and would raise up Christ of Abraham's seed to sit on the throne of David, although the Jews should be cast off for their sins, and another people would be taken out from among the Gentiles in their stead.

The unbelieving Jews not only disregarded all these warnings, but also did everything in their power to frustrate the accomplishment of the prophecies by crucifying Christ himself, and persecuting to the utmost all who believed in him, hoping thereby to crush in the bud this dreaded Christian Church, although their own prophecies abound in declarations that it should at some future day fill the whole earth. It is evident that the Scribes and Pharisees knew the general tenor of the prophecies, but were ignorant of the manner in which they would be accomplished. When asked by Herod, they readily answered, from the prophecies, that Bethlehem Judah was the place in which the Messiah should be born: and then, knowing that our Lord had declared that after three days he would rise again, they did all that lay in their power to frustrate this prediction; and when their efforts failed, and they were told by their own watch, who had been eye witnesses of the fact, that he was actually risen from the dead—yet still this unquestionable miracle in accomplishment of our Lord's prophecy had no effect upon these infatuatedly prejudiced men: it only hardened them the more, so as to add subornation of falsehood to rejection of the truth, by their giving money to the watch in order to conceal the fact and charge the disciples with stealing the body, though, in so doing, they would necessarily subject themselves to the accusation of having neglected their own duty. And the rancour with which the Pharisees pursued the first disciples is evinced in the words of St. Paul before Agrippa, who asserts that, while acting under the authority of the chief priests, he thought it his duty to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, saying, "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison, and when they were put to death I gave my voice against them; and I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and, being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities" (Acts xxvi. 11).

The prophecies of the Old Testament are referred to by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, as then being fulfilled in a very remarkable manner—first, in the resurrection of Christ; secondly, in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the believers,

He appeals first to the prophecy of Joel as being accomplished in the dispensation beginning from that time, and spoken of by the prophet as the last days, during which God would pour out of his Spirit on all flesh (Acts ii. 16). On which it is to be observed that the "all flesh" spoken of by the prophet is meant to indicate that *other races* of mankind would be admitted to the same privileges as the Jews under the new dispensation, by the breaking down of the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile: it does not mean that the Spirit will be poured out upon all mankind, whether believers or unbelievers; for it is immediately added that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved: on which St. Paul's comment is—"How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?—and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?—and how shall they hear without a preacher?—and how shall they preach except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 14). And St. Peter accordingly preaches to the assembled multitude, saying, "Ye men of Israel hear these words—Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." And then, after quoting the prophecies which refer to the resurrection of Christ, concludes—"This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he (that is Christ) hath shed forth this (that is the Holy Spirit) which ye now see and hear.....Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made this same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." And when the multitude, being moved by these words, cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"—Peter answers, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts ii. 39).

We thus see that the prophecy of Joel could not have its fulfilment until the time when Christ, being raised from the dead, had ascended into heaven, and gave the Holy Ghost to them that believe in his name; yet the name of Christ does

not appear in Joel's prophecy, although his meritorious death and exaltation to the right hand of the Father is the procuring cause. And as, for the first reception of the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, faith in Christ as the giver, and baptism as being instituted by Christ for that express purpose were the necessary conditions—so, for the continuance of the Holy Spirit in the Church, and for the admission of succeeding generations to the same privileges, like faith and like obedience are at all times necessary; for the Church is one, and the faith and baptism are one, throughout all generations. But if our readers will turn to the prophecy of Joel, they will find that a part only of its contents was accomplished at the commencement of the present dispensation, and another and more important portion remains to be fulfilled at the close of the Christian dispensation or times of the Gentiles—that is, fulfilled in the restoration of the Jews, and the destruction of the apostate nations, and in the latter day glory of the Church and people of God, with the announcement of which all the most important of the Old Testament prophecies invariably terminate.

For Joel's prophecy passes on without a pause to the great and terrible day of the Lord, before which the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood—signs which Christ himself makes the precursors of his second coming in the Gospels, and which are connected with the approach of the same time in the symbolical language of the Apocalypse (Rev. vi. 12). But immediately connected with that day of judgment, and one of the most conspicuous of its many features in the Old Testament prophecies, is the restoring of the captivity of Israel, and bringing them back to Jerusalem and the land of their fathers, to be no more cast out: after which Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation (Joel, iii. 20). And thus the prophecy of Joel not only covers the whole of the times of the Gentiles but embraces the restoration of the Jews also; and, by parity of reasoning, relates not only to the first coming of Christ and the giving of the Holy Ghost, but also to his second coming without sin unto salvation (Heb. ix. 28)—his coming to be glorified in his saints and to be admired in all them that believe.

Prophecy thus spans all time, because it is the declaration of the counsels of God; and no part of time is uncovered by prophecy, because this would be almost as absurd as the supposing that a portion of time was overlooked by God, or a portion of the human race not under his controul; yet, since the Hebrew prophecies more especially concern the Jewish

people, and do for the most part either entirely pass by, or only casually refer to, the Gentile dispensation, our Gentile Church has one book of the New Testament Scriptures which is devoted solely to the prophetic history of the intermediate times—between the casting off of the Jews and their restoration—between the first and second Advents—between the first fruits on the day of Pentecost and the final ingathering at the feast of tabernacles. This book of Christian prophecy is the Apocalypse—the last book of the sacred canon.

Of the Apocalypse, therefore, its *intermediate* character is the great feature: it takes up a portion of time during which God is dealing with the Gentiles, to make known his counsels towards them, in the same manner as he has made himself known to the Jews in the Old Testament; and, as the counsel of God is one and unchangeable, and worldly affairs are governed by him, not he by them—so, the Old and New Testaments relate to one purpose and issue in the same result, and are only successive chapters of the same history, inseparably interwoven with each other.

"All commentators (says the late Bishop Jebb), have observed the striking resemblance between portions of the Apocalypse, considerable both in number and extent, and the prophetic books of the Old Testament; and since the days of Bishop Louth some have, though slightly, adverted to the poetical imagery and structure of those resembling portions. The student who wishes rightly to apprehend and to appreciate the language of this last and most mysterious book of the sacred canon will do well to compare attentively the several correspondent passages of it and of the prophets."

Mr. Hoare, in the volume before us, has endeavoured to bring out this resemblance by printing, parallel with the text of the Apocalypse, a paraphrase composed of the very words of the Old Testament, extracted from the prophecies which the apostolic seer appears to have in his eye—bringing out in this comparison, not merely the connection of the two as forming one purpose, but the place which the Jews and Gentiles occupy towards each other in time, as St. Paul teaches us their place theologically and in the abstract in the tenth and eleventh chapters of his epistle to the Romans:—"This may be done by a careful selection of the most appropriate passages—placing in one column the text of St. John, and in another a combination of passages from other parts of Scripture most nearly agreeing with it both in expression and in subject matter—and thus forming a kind of *Scripture Paraphrase* to this book." And in so doing a light has been thrown upon the divisions of the book itself, suggesting an arrange-

ment of its parts which has escaped the generality of interpreters—namely, in the introduction of a chorus or song of triumph seven times, indicating seven distinct visions or acts; the divisions being the following:—iv. 8-11; v. 8-14; vii. 9-13; xi. 15-19; xii. 10-13; xv. 3-5; xix. 1-8; in each of which places the triumphant song is introduced.

It has been the aim of Mr. Hoare, in this volume, rather to afford facilities to all for studying and understanding the Apocalypse themselves than to advocate any of the systems which have already appeared, or to propose one of his own devising. He thinks that, with the exception of those who regard the events as past and those who regard them as entirely future—and whom it would be mere waste of time to notice—all interpreters have many points of agreement; and this agreement will become closer and closer as more of the prophecy becomes fulfilled in the course of events.

"Later generations may perceive the application of prophecies necessarily hidden from those of earlier times; and, indeed, it seems purposely intended that, before the fulfilment, there should be much obscurity as to *particular* points, while the *general* design was clear and satisfactory" (Introduction).

The general principles on which it is presumed that all sound interpreters of the present time agree are, first, that the Revelation is a prophecy extending over a very considerable range of time; secondly, that, as such, it is conducted on a principle of progressive development, and comprehends a series or continued succession of events in the Church's history; thirdly, that, while occasional interruptions by way of ode, episode, &c., confessedly occur, they are not of a nature to prevent the general principle from being, on the whole, maintained throughout. And when, to this view of the arrangement or general economy of the book, we add the consideration of its theme or object, we find on this point also the same kind of agreement among the different interpreters, all considering it to be *the development and final consummation of the kingdom of Christ till his coming again to judge the world, and to crown his Church with eternal glory.* With so much that all are agreed on, it seems mere perverseness to speak only of the minor differences among interpreters, and on this account to decry the study of the Revelation altogether as a sealed book, or to resort to something new by way of interpretation.

But, as we have on many former occasions observed, events are now continually springing forth of so marked and striking

a character as to shed a clearer light than before upon the prophecies which belong to the Christian Church: upon the Apocalypse in the first place, and then upon all those Old Testament prophecies which are glanced at by St. John, or have furnished him with the imagery, or symbolical language, which enters so largely into the composition of this last book of Scripture; and which, being the last, we have for ourselves regarded as bringing into a focus of stronger light all the scattered rays pervading the whole sacred volume which bear upon our times—times which we verily believe to be the last days.

Among the ancient prophets Daniel is called "greatly beloved" (ix. 23); and he was more highly favoured than any other who lived before the coming of Christ, in being shown that a long time would elapse before the first coming of Messiah, and that there would be a still longer interval between this, his first coming, to make an end of sin by the sacrifice of himself, and his second coming to establish that kingdom which shall never be removed, and to give the dominion to the saints of the Most High; and Daniel was also shown that this intervening time would be a time of great affliction to his people. The character of John, the Christian prophet, is very similar: he was the beloved disciple; and to him, in like manner, was revealed the various trials and tribulations awaiting the Church during the time of the Lord's absence—that is, until his second coming as beheld by Daniel in the seventh chapter of his visions. St. John adopts in the Apocalypse the very symbols and numbers of Daniel, as we might naturally expect, seeing that both prophecies treat of the same time. But this way of regarding it is not strong enough; for both were beholding *visions of God*, and, therefore, GOD was using *the same symbols and the same numbers*, on *both* occasions, to teach the *same* lessons concerning the *same* times.

We know of no commentator on the Apocalypse who has better apprehended the connection between this book and the prophecies of Daniel than Mr. Frere, whose last pamphlet upon the subject we have placed at the head of our remarks; and as he has been very long prosecuting the enquiry, with the view of confirming or modifying his first impressions by the subsequent events, we have before us the deliberate convictions of thirty-five years, employed in comparing the announcements of prophecy with their fulfilment in passing events: for Mr. Frere tells us that he began his studies of this subject in 1813, and has become more and more convinced of the truths which he then embraced, as each succeeding year

has brought with it new and astonishing deeds confirmatory of his former expectations, and of the general principles by which those prophecies were brought to bear upon the passing events of modern times—making occurrences, which all see to be momentous, infinitely so.

Mr. Frere is among those who have insisted upon understanding the two earthquakes (Rev. vi. 12; xi. 13, 19) as significant of two revolutions, both to begin in France; first a preparation for, or a type and warning of, the second—the former as having taken place in 1793—the latter as about to take place in 1847, or before the end of March, 1848. The event has confirmed these expectations so far as time is the element; but there were other elements as to the agents to be employed and the manner in which it should be brought about; and, in these respects, the course of events has rendered certain changes or modifications of those former expectations necessary: for, after the fall of Napoleon, Mr. Frere expected that the King of Rome would fulfil that part in the prophetic drama which was assigned to the successor of Napoleon; but when the son also died it became necessary to look out for another, of the same house or dynasty, to accomplish those prophecies yet remaining to be fulfilled.

"The prophecies of Daniel relating to Antichrist *in his first manifestation*, as seventh head of the western Roman empire, were fulfilled in the person of Napoleon Buonaparte. Those relating to Antichrist *in his second manifestation*, as eighth head of the empire (including an enigma yet unexplained), are, I conceive, now about to be fulfilled" (46). "The supposition originally entertained, that the seventh vial would be included (together with the preceding six vials) in the thirty years of Daniel, ending A.D. 1822-3, led (with other reasons) to the almost necessary conclusion that what is to be performed by the Antichrist of the last days, as the eighth and last head of the empire (Dan. xi. 40-45), would be fulfilled *personally* by Napoleon Buonaparte (who had already fulfilled, in the years 1796 to 1812, all the foregoing part of the prophecy, Dan. xi. 21-39). The lapse of time has corrected these erroneous suppositions; *the literal interpretation* of all the prophecies that relate to the infidel Antichrist, in his last manifestation as sovereign of Rome, and eighth head of the empire remains however unaltered; to which, as given in my former work, and now about to be fulfilled (the revolution of the seventh vial having unquestionably commenced), I beg to refer the reader" (p. 8.)

Mr. Frere has also found it necessary to alter his views, concerning the restoration of the Jews, by the course of events: for having regarded the declarations in the last chapters of Daniel as referring to events which would happen in consecutive order, he supposed that the restoration of the Jews, which

predicted in the early part of the twelfth chapter, would take place before the expiration of the 1290 years mentioned in the latter part of the same chapter—consequently before the year 1823—assuming that the 1260 and 1290 years may have had the same commencement; but Mr. Frere, now finding that the whole period up to the present time has been occupied in works *preparatory* to the pouring out of the seventh vial, thinks that this vial itself (terminating with the restoration of the Jews) must be the subject of the following period of twenty years, from 1847 to 1867—now commencing and immediately preceding the Millennium (p. 12); and he, therefore, holds that the last chapter of Daniel consists of two distinct parts:

"First, the main prophecy terminating at xii. 7, with the announcement of the restoration of the Jews; secondly, the explanation thereof by the attendant angel, who is commissioned to show it to the prophet, contained in chap. xii. 8, to the end; these two distinct portions being of course parallel to each other in point of time" (p. 10). "Let me hope (says Mr. Frere) that the cursory reader of prophecy will pass over with indulgence the foregoing demonstration of prophetic truth, and be satisfied for himself with being thus put in possession of such an important result; and will at the same time forgive me when I confess that *the existence of the difficulties* in the prophetic text, which I have felt myself now called upon to explain, together with the way in which they have been opened by the progress of time alone, are to me among the most interesting circumstances connected with the study of prophecy, and are, indeed, intensely so" (18).

We know somewhat of the pleasure resulting from a triumph over difficulties of this kind, and of the intense delight which accompanies such discoveries of our own mistakes and such vindication of the word of God: it not only demonstrates that the former declarations and their present fulfilment are by the same God in whose hand are all things; but it gives us the assurance that all the other portions of his word shall have as literal an accomplishment, and that not only in things that are visible and temporal but in those that are spiritual and eternal. But we must also add that we do not go all lengths with Mr. Frere in his application of prophecy; for we think that he is often too minute, and runs also into the common mistake of exaggerating the importance of those things with which we ourselves are immediately conversant, blinding us to the really superior claims of things at a distance from us. We have no doubt that much good has been done by the Bible Society and other associations of this description; yet, to represent these reformation societies and evangelical alliances as fulfilling the things which were sig-

nified by the prophetic acts of the angels in the Apocalypse is almost ludicrous. The angel who seals the servants of God in the seventh chapter must, we think, have reference to an act done towards the servants of God in all parts of Christendom, and may not be limited to so narrow a sphere as a few believers in Great Britain; for the correlative of the people of Israel is the one Church of the baptized throughout all Christendom. And still less can we allow the angels of the fourteenth chapter to be thus limited, since the very call to come out of Babylon indicates that the cry reaches every part of Christendom; and the blessing on the dead is on all who die in the Lord in all lands.

We also think that Mr. Frere makes too much of Esdras. It is an apocryphal book: we refuse to receive it as prophetic, because it has not been admitted into the canon: it is a private book, and whatsoever value Mr. Frere attaches to it is only his private opinion: it cannot be received as of ecclesiastical authority or as the word of God. Again: we think that Mr. Frere is wrong in pertinaciously adhering to the number 2400 in the eighth chapter of Daniel, after Mr. Cunninghame had clearly shown that it was a misprint, and is not contained in the Vatican manuscript, nor in any other known manuscript whatsoever; and especially as the true reading of 2300, when rightly interpreted, expires in the same year, 1847.

We ourselves have arrived at general results similar to those of Mr. Frere, although we have been led by a different road. We began with the Old Testament, and the book of Isaiah, and the minor prophets, before entering on a comparison between Daniel and the Apocalypse; but the results are the same: for, as we have already said in speaking of the prophet Joel, they all terminate in a great act of judgment upon the heathen, the place being named Jehoshaphat, or the judgment of Jehovah, on this account; which act is accompanied by the restoration of the Jews to the land promised to their fathers; but the place of judgment is in the Apocalypse called (Rev. xvi. 16) Armageddon, which means the valley of decision. This, therefore, is the turning point both in the Jewish and the Christian history: the casting away of the Jews was the reconciling of the world (Rom. xi. 15)—the receiving of them shall be life from the dead: blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; but there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob (verse 26).

The preparation for this act of judgment goes on during

the whole time of the sixth vial; and it is two-fold, symbolized by the drying up of the Euphrates, which signifies a removal of all obstacles which stand in the way of the restoration of the Jews; and by three unclean spirits going forth among the heathen, to gather their armies to the great day of judgment, or Jehoshaphat and Armageddon. The preparation is the only thing mentioned under the sixth vial; and it is in the nature of things slow: it is like the slow evaporation of water, and like the gradual undermining of society by the introduction of principles which are subversive of law and order—a disorganization of all things. And the earthquake—which takes place immediately after the seventh vial is poured out—though it is a consequence of the going forth of the unclean spirits, is only another act of preparation for the day of the Lord: it is no part of the battle of Armageddon, nor does it exhaust the effects of the evil principles; but they will still continue to operate, and their workings will be most perverse. There can be no doubt of what these three classes of evil principles are when we remember the sources from whence they proceed—the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet: they are infidelity, despotism, and superstition. But what do we see now but total inconsistency, even in the working out of principles which are in themselves erroneous? We behold a liberal Pope—a contradiction in terms—beginning the present continental revolution, thinking that men could be liberal outside of a church wall and remain good Catholics within, donning their liberality at the doors as they would their caps! We behold the creatures of a Parisian mob, elected on the widest scheme of democracy, liberty, and equality, resorting to measures far more absolute and despotic than any which have been alleged against their former rulers under the monarchy! And, if report speak true, we are about to see the Czar—the type of despotism—give to his serfs a larger measure of freedom than would be allowed to their subjects by his liberal neighbours!

Nor is the dividing of the city into three parts anything more than another act of preparation for this great final catastrophe of Armageddon. It is not by the agency of the unclean spirits that Christendom is thus divided, but by the earthquake or convulsion of the seventh vial; and it merely denotes that there will be three rallying points or heads, and not that these will be necessarily evil. Yet it would seem as though the tenfold division of the Roman empire would then cease, and become merged in this new threefold division; and that out of these three divisions the unclean spirits would

be gathering such as abide not in the fear of God and the faith of the Gospel to lead them to the destruction at Armageddon.

The things which are acting before our eyes give a practical importance to the study of prophecy far greater than it has ever had before. It is only by knowing the truth that we can be kept from error: and, as the delusions of the last times will be greater and more subtle than any former delusions, so we require a larger measure of understanding in the ways of God to keep ourselves from the evil which abounds. The faithful are represented as overcoming by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony (xii. 11). And at the very time of the pouring out of the last vial the Lord saith, "Behold, I come as a thief! Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked and they see his shame" (xvi. 15). And again: "Behold I come quickly. Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of this book. Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be" (xxii. 7, 12).

And we think that our readers will find no book better calculated to help them in comparing the prophecies of the Old Testament with those of the New, and applying both to the events now in course of progress, than Mr. Hoare's "Harmony of the Apocalypse."

ART. XII.—*Contributions towards an Harmony of the Holy Gospels.* Rivingtons. 1848.

THIS is a very judicious and scholarly volume: it is so unpretending that even the name of the author does not appear; and it leads us at once to the point without any circumlocution, putting the reader in possession of all the information which the author has been able to collect, with only just such remarks as are desirable for showing the real state of the case.

The "Harmony" itself is printed in a tabular form, and only occupies eight pages, divided into two hundred sections or paragraphs; each section consisting of one incident, or parable, or miracle, arranged in chronological order: with the Gospel columns opposite, showing in what chapter and verse of each the narrative is to be found. The remainder of

the volume consists of dissertations on the language of the Gospels; on the authors, and the time at which they were severally written; on the chronology in general, and on some particular epochs which have influenced the order of arrangement in the tables. A specimen is also given of such a connected history of the life of Christ as might be very easily constructed from the tabular harmony, in a "Monotessaron," of the great forty days after the resurrection and until the ascension of our Lord, during which he appeared ten several times to the disciples, and taught them concerning the things of the kingdom, collected from St. Paul's testimony as well as the Gospels and Acts.

The author's own words in the preface will give the best idea of the nature of the work before us:—

"First of all I have endeavoured to form an accurate notion of *the thing to be done.* Every writer on the 'Evangelical Harmony,' whose work I have had an opportunity of consulting, undertakes, as it seems to me, at once too much and too little. Topics in themselves comparatively trivial, and, if relevant at all to the end contemplated, only relevant in the most remote degree, are handled with disproportionate assiduity and copiousness; while enquiries vital to the argument are slurred over with the most cursory mention. Of both extremes, I have been anxious to keep clear. Whatever topic seemed cognate to the the main design has received my best attention—whatever seemed cumbersome or excrescent I have not scrupled to discard.

"Again: throughout the following work I have deemed it but what was due to my precursors and to the subject to avail myself of every *aid to investigation* which happened to be within my reach. In the field of ancient research, Lardner, Greswell, and a multitude of others, have left nothing to be desired or to be done; and though almost every quotation introduced in these pages has been carefully collated with the original, I have to avow, with the great author of the 'Evidences of Christianity,' that I have found my materials ready to my hand, 'my office consisting but in arrangement and selection.' The evidence methodised and sifted, I have next made it my business to *hear counsel* on all sides of the questions to which it appertains; and have listened to the *reason*, as well as used the *learning*, which has been attracted to the argument. If this method entails an access of perplexity, it opens up at the same time the only avenue to an ultimately satisfactory decision; for if every author begins *de novo* a task which, in one or other of its parts, has so long occupied the best intellects of Christendom, he must needs forego the most important aids to progress, and will be chiefly original in some fresh variety of error."

The dissertations are four: first, on the External History of the Gospels, with Biographical Notices of the Four Evangelists; secondly, the Internal Phenomena of Resemblance or

Contrast in the several Gospels; thirdly, the General Principles for determining the Gospel Harmony; fourthly, the Chronology, and especially on the length of our Lord's Ministry: and the utility of the whole is greatly increased by a very copious synopsis of the contents at the beginning, and valuable notes and references at the end, of the volume.

On the external history of the Gospels, one of the most important points of enquiry for us is the order and origin of the same—that is, the time when, and the purpose for which, each one of them was composed; since it might, *a priori*, be thought that one single narrative would suffice to make known the history and doctrines of Christianity, and would be the simple course were this the sole object in view. But when we also find that in the several Gospels there is diversity of plan, and that certain facts are treated more largely in some of the Gospels than in the others, and that some of these prominent facts are even passed over in the other Gospels, it can scarcely be doubted that there were special reasons for these differences, or that each Gospel was called for by some peculiar circumstances which pressed upon the heart of him by whom it was composed, giving it a special suitability to that portion of Church with which that particular evangelist was brought into contact.

Our author adopts the generally received opinion that the Gospel of St. Matthew was that first composed, and that it was written in the dialect of the country, as the discourses of our Lord were of course spoken in that language, because none other would be understood by his audience—consisting of a mixed multitude, including women and children. And, indeed, the frequent occurrence of Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic phrases and idioms proves this, both of the Gospel and of the discourses of our Lord; and it was a matter of surprise to the Scribes and Pharisees that Jesus should be able to read the pure Hebrew, for they said, "How knoweth this man letters, never having learned?"

The opinions of the fathers, from Irenæus to Jerome, are cited, which might have been increased to any extent as so many additional witnesses to the facts—in which all antiquity is agreed to a man—that St. Matthew wrote first; that he wrote in Hebrew (that is, the common dialect of Judea); and that he wrote for the Hebrew Church. And they are equally unanimous in testifying to the general opinion or tradition that it was afterwards translated into Greek, though it is not known by whom the translation was made.

On the time at which St. Matthew composed his Gospel

there is not the same unanimity. Irenæus asserts that it was written while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and founding the Church in that city—an opinion which our author thinks utterly untenable as too late; for Paul's first visit to Rome cannot possibly be placed earlier than A.D. 58: and in all probability Peter's coming to Rome was much later, though this is less certain; for it cannot be proved historically when Peter first went to Rome—nay, cannot be proved that he ever was there. The Paschal Chronicle, composed in the seventh century, states that it was published about fifteen years after the ascension, and soon after the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv). A third opinion is that of Eusebius, who, in his "Chronicon," assigns the third year of Caligula, A.D. 40, as the period when Matthew published his Gospel; and this is the date which our author rests upon as the only time which will agree with all the necessary conditions.

The probability is, that this Gospel for the Hebrews was written for their exclusive use at a time when the preaching of the Gospel was limited to Jews alone before the conversion of Cornelius, and while the disciples were scrupulously obeying the first injunctions of their Lord, who, in sending forth the twelve apostles, "commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x. 5)—a limitation of their preaching which is not mentioned by Mark or Luke, and affording a presumption that Matthew wrote before the conversion of Cornelius, but that Mark and Luke wrote after that time.

"And it is a remarkable coincidence that the only fragment of intelligence which primitive antiquity furnishes on the subject conducts us to the same epoch. Clement, of Alexandria (A.D. 200), extracts the following passage from a work extant in his day called 'The Preaching of Peter:'—'Peter says that the Lord said to the apostles—After twelve years go ye forth into the world, that none may say, we have not heard.' Eusebius also acquaints us that Apollonius, a contemporary of Clement, related, as from accounts handed down, that our Saviour commanded the apostles not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years. Now, I am not concerned with the question whether or not such injunctions were ever issued. They may or they may not: but I contend that the very ascription of them to our Lord is a proof of their accordance with the real state of the case. Whatever be thought of the authenticity of the reason, the very effort implied in preserving or in inventing it shows the notoriety of the facts" (5).

The last injunctions of our Lord immediately before his ascension were, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, *beginning at Jeru-*

salem" (Luke xxiv. 47); and they were also commanded to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high (verse 49). How long they remained together at Jerusalem does not clearly appear; but when the disciples were scattered abroad on the persecution which arose after Stephen's martyrdom, the apostles are expressly excepted (Acts viii. 1). And even after Peter and John had been sent to Samaria, and after the conversion of Cornelius which ensues thereupon, the college of apostles, as we may call it, and the head quarters of the Church, was still Jerusalem; for it is said, "And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God" (Acts xi. 1). As if it had been quite an extraordinary and exceptional act to leave Jerusalem at all, as we know it was a most repugnant act to go in among the Gentiles; and therefore a special vision was vouchsafed to Peter to overcome his scruples, and he was called to account for his conduct, and justified himself by appealing to the direct interposition of God, which satisfied the Hebrew Church at Jerusalem.

We have been accustomed to place the conversion of Cornelius earlier than the year 40; but this is not essential to the argument; for some time would elapse before the Gentiles would need the Gospel to be translated into Greek, since the preachers by whom they were converted would continue among them giving *viva voce* instruction. And it is remarkable to find no allusion in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the epistles to the Churches, to any such books as the Gospels, leading us to infer that the living witness of men, filled with the Holy Ghost, was that which alone was regarded as of sufficient weight to warrant the substitution of a new religion, in place of that which God had himself given from Mount Sinai; or to break down the wall of partition placed by him between the Jews and the other nations of the earth. There were these valid reasons; and the natural prejudices in favour of their own people and language tended to increase their reluctance to forego these exclusive privileges, and to amalgamate with the one family of mankind out of all the tribes of which God was now about to gather the Christian Church, placing all believers on the same footing.

Even so late as St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, which was seventeen years after his conversion, we find that the preaching to the Gentiles was regarded as the proper work of Paul and Barnabas, from which therefore the other apostles ought rather to abstain; for he says that James, Peter, and John "gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fel-

lowship, that we should go to the heathen and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 9). And the epistles both of James and Peter are addressed to the Jewish converts; whereas all the epistles of Paul, save one, are written to Churches which he had gathered from among the Gentiles. And the heading of St. Luke's Gospel shows that the first instructions were oral, and that written histories had been afterwards prepared to keep in memory the things wherein they had been instructed.

Our author, having satisfied himself that St. Matthew's Gospel was published within twelve years of the ascension, examines the relationship which the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke bear to this earliest of the Christian records, to discover, by *internal* evidence, in what order of time they have been composed. By this test, of a careful comparison of their several accounts of the same transactions, he thinks it is made evident that the evangelists had recourse to each other, and that St. Luke must have borrowed from St. Matthew, and St. Mark from both the preceding; and that Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John, is the order in which the Gospels were written; for all are agreed that St. John's Gospel was that which was last composed, shortly before the departure of the last of the apostles; and that it embodies the deepest mysteries of the faith which had been, among the spiritual, the subjects of discussion only in seasons of seclusion, and during their highest devotional acts and most confidential intercourse:—

"To say that St. Matthew was one of the twelve; that he was consequently an eye or ear-witness of almost all he has put on record; and that he was in constant association for fourteen years with those who could supply the very few particulars removed from his personal experience, is to say that he must be considered an original author, and that his history must take rank as the fontal Gospel—the pure and only *Protevangelium*. Since St. Matthew's informants were his own senses, and he was in immediate contact with the scenes he depicts, his narrative borrows nothing from any other writing and admits no relation except to the events.....The *mind*, then the *memory*, of the first evangelist is the adequate and only credible source to which, so far as human agency is concerned, we can trace back the first Gospel. With the *second* evangelist (that is, St. Luke) however, the case is widely different. That he was no apostle nor original disciple of whatever degree—that his knowledge was mediate not immediate, the product merely of historical research not of personal observation—he distinctly admonishes his readers in his preface.....I also (saith he), having traced all things exactly, &c. This qualifying adverb, ***exactly***, affords the clearest proof of what is here intended—the ***judgment***, namely, of the author, as the *instrument of enquiry*—not his ***eyes*** or his ***ears***, as the *channels of perception*" (69).

But St. Luke declares that many had taken in hand the setting in order of the Christian history; consequently, there were floating traditions which needed to be set in order beside the Gospel of St. Matthew—the only published or generally acknowledged record: and, by comparing the narrative of these two evangelists, a close verbal resemblance often appears, as though St. Luke was quoting St. Matthew; yet the altered arrangement, "and fluctuating degrees of approach, show quotation from memory; and the felicitous insertions, substitutions, and supplements, show an author who *improves* while he *follows* his original." In some passages, St. Luke spreads over two or three occasions, or two or three distinct parties, acts which St. Matthew leads us to regard as occurring on one occasion only. This dislocation, our author thinks, "is at least partially systematic;" and that St. Luke, in many instances, deviated intentionally from St. Matthew's track—*deviated* not *dissented.*

"Of two versions of the same parable, or two applications of the same precept, it would be quite on the analogy of his general plan to prefer that which was *not pre-occupied* by St. Matthew; and for his opportunity of selection, in regard to a context, I conceive he was indebted to those auxiliary informants of which mention is made in his preface. That our Lord frequently repeated his moral maxims and parables sometimes word for word, at other times slightly altered, applying former lessons on fresh occasions and bringing from his treasures things new and old, we may well consider certain; and if St. Luke came to the knowledge of *two* occasions on which similar or the same sentiments were uttered he would naturally, while retaining the *old matter* as necessary for those who had not access to the former Gospel, select the *new connection*, as a suitable variety for those who had" (p. 78).

St. Mark in composing his Gospel had recourse to the two already extant written by St. Matthew and St. Luke; but being a Jewish convert, and accustomed to meet the disciples in his mother's house, the Gospel of St. Matthew was known to him before that of St. Luke was written, and being also officially connected with St. Peter he had access to a living informant. All these circumstances account for his general adherence to St. Matthew, and the characteristic copiousness and minute accuracy of some of his details. "St. Mark's recourse to St. Matthew was *closer than St. Luke's.* And again: St. Mark's recourse to St. Luke was *less close than his recourse St. Matthew.* St. Matthew was a father and superior—St. Luke only a brother and an equal."

St. Mark omits some of the things mentioned in the two preceding Gospels concerning the birth and early history of our Lord in order to hasten to his ministry, which was the

chief point of interest to the Roman converts for whom this Gospel was primarily designed. With this intention kept in view, it will be found that St. Mark's omissions of historical matter peculiar to St. Matthew are few in number—small in bulk—and advantageous, on the whole, to the compactness and even flow of the narrative.

The testimony of Eusebius concerning the Gospel of St. John is, that it was written, not to supersede the other Gospels, but to add various discourses of our Lord which the other evangelists had omitted; but it not only supplies omissions—it also is, in its subject matter, of a deeper and higher kind, dealing with our Lord himself, and what he was *essentially* and inherently, rather than with his mere words or deeds. Clement of Alexandria draws the distinction by calling the three former Gospels *corporeal*, as relating to external and visible things; but he calls that of St. John the *spiritual* Gospel, as relating to invisible and heavenly things—such as the sixth chapter contains and the fourteenth on the Comforter. It begins with the declaration of the eternal subsistence of the Word which was God, and concludes in stating its purport to be that men may believe in Christ as the Son of God, and, believing, may have life through his name.

"Hence, in sublimity of subject matter, this evangelist far transcends his brethren: *they* find their theme on earth: *he* fetches his theme from heaven: *they* dwell on the objective humanity of Christ: *he* on the subjective divinity: *theirs* are the corporeal Gospels of the Son of Man: *his* the spiritual Gospel of the Son of God. The record of the life of Jesus was *their* directing idea: *his* was the manifestation of his glory: in *them* we have the *Vita*: in *him* the Pectus Christi."

Having pointed out so many things in which we agree with our author, it is due to him and to our readers that we should say that we do not agree with him in his assigning no longer a period than two years to the ministry of our Lord. We, on the contrary, think that it can be demonstrably shown that our Lord's ministry lasted, at least, three years; but the proof would require more space than we can at present command. Nor do we deem this point of such great importance as it is esteemed by many to be, for no doctrine is at all affected by it: the facts stand the same at whatever time they may have taken place, and we have long felt persuaded that it is utterly impossible to fix to a certainty any of the great epochs in ancient history, such as the birth or the crucifixion of our Lord.

We scarcely need add that we think very highly of the volume before us, and most cordially recommend it to all who are engaged in the study of the Gospels.

Notices of Books.

Letters to a Waverer on the Romish Controversy. By the Rev. Samuel Hobson, LL.B. London: Seeleys. 1848. 12mo.

This work supplies a desideratum in our modern controversial literature; and if it should come into the hands of any "waverer," who *will* give it a candid perusal and examination, it can scarcely fail, with the divine blessing, to preserve him from being perverted to Popery. It is written throughout with a calm, gentle, and serious temper; and its value is enhanced by the addition of references to the authorities from which the author has drawn his materials.

Mr. Hobson states that this work originated in his own want of a comprehensive manual, which he could put into the hands of a friend, who, "attracted by the pomp and splendour, and yielding to the fascination of the Romish mode of worship, had at length become entangled in the snares of Popery." His design is to exhibit the more essential points of difference between Romanists and Protestants, and to contrast the errors and corruptions of Popery with the scriptural purity and excellence of the Church of England. In the prosecution of this design, he has enriched his pages with valuable quotations from Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Hooker, and other distinguished fathers of our Church; and he has placed the results of his enquiries before his readers in a perspicuous and popular form. The following are the subjects discussed by Mr. Hobson—viz., The outward Attractions of Romanism; Scripture the Test of Truth; the Opposition of the Romish Church to the use of the Scriptures, and the importance of studying them; Supremacy and Infallibility arrogant and unreasonable; and a comparison between Rome and Geneva, in which the Christian moderation of the Church of England towards non-episcopal Churches appears to great advantage. These topics are followed by an examination and refutation of the Romish doctrine concerning transubstantiation, the real presence, and the necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of a sacrament, baptism and the *opus operatum*, and justification by faith. Mr. Newman's erroneous views of justification are thoroughly sifted and refuted. Purgatory and prayers for the dead, auricular confession and its dangerous tendency, are next discussed: and the demoralizing, antisocial, and destructive doctrines of the Romish Church, especially those taught in the writings of the recently canonized *saint*, Alphonso

Liguori, are exposed, and contrasted with the very different principles inculcated by the Church of England. The volume concludes with some observations on the ignorance of Romanists as to the real tenets of their Church on the Popish mode of convincing heretics, and on the effects produced by Protestantism and Popery respectively, and with concise answers to certain Popish objections.

From this brief analysis of the topics discussed by Mr. Hobson, it will be perceived that all the material points of the Romish controversy have been brought forward, and, we must add, satisfactorily refuted. The typographical execution of the volume is singularly neat; and, what is no trifling consideration, it is offered to the public at a reasonable price. Mr. Hobson is already advantageously known as the author of numerous many practical tracts, which are admirably adapted to impart information to the working and agricultural classes, and many of which have for some years been on the list of the excellent tracts circulated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Christian Consolation. By DANIEL MOORE, M.A. London: Bowdery. 1848.

THIS is a series of "Discourses on the Reliefs afforded by the Gospel under different States and Trials of the Christian Life," by the perpetual curate of Camden district, Camberwell. The volume is inscribed by the reverend writer to his congregation, among whom he is deservedly popular—a circumstance which must greatly enhance the usefulness of these discourses; and we can well imagine that he could scarcely have made them a more acceptable offering. To say that Mr. Moore illustrates his preaching by his life is to remark that of him which we honestly believe is applicable to the great majority of his fellow-labourers in the vineyard; but we also believe that there are few among them who so entirely carry with them the hearts of their flock. The style of these discourses is simple, earnest, and affectionate; for the general soundness of their doctrine, his reputation as a divine is a sufficient warrant.

Essays on Human Happiness. By Dr. HENRY DUHRING. London: Longman.

CLEARLY, sensibly, and, we doubt not, honestly, written; full of acknowledgments of a *Creator*, but without one allusion to a *Redeemer*. The author may be a Jew or a Mahomedan, for aught that we find in these pages to the contrary.

The Imperial Dictionary, English, Technological, and Scientific; adapted to the present state of Literature, Science and Art; on the basis of Webster's English Dictionary, with the addition of many thousand Words and Phrases from the other Standard Dictionaries and Encyclopædias, and from numerous other Sources, comprising all words purely English, and the Principal and most General and Technical and Scientific Terms; together with their Etymologies and their Pronunciation, according to the best Authorities. Illustrated by about Two Thousand Engravings on Wood. Edited by JOHN OGILVIE, LL.D. Volume the First. London and Edinburgh: Blackie and Son, 1848.

THE dictionary, of all works, is the most progressive; and its actual value must be dependent upon its being brought up to the actual state of our knowledge. The last great English dictionary was sent from America. Barker's English edition of Webster's may be looked upon as an improvement upon the original. Dr. Ogilvie, as we think, has wisely taken the latter as his basis, and in addition to that fundamental stock, enriches his work by diligent researches through the other standard dictionaries, encyclopædias, and technical and scientific authorities; and the result has been the production of the first volume of certainly the most copious dictionary of the English language hitherto published. Of late years science has so rapidly extended its boundaries—new terms of pressing practical utility have grown upon us so fast, and language itself in other respects, especially since the continent has been thrown open to the traveller, has undergone such a revolution, that a dictionary, such as that now before us, compiled as it is with an erudition equal to the infinite demands of the undertaking, may be regarded as one of the most important accessions to our library which has of late issued from the press. Dr. Ogilvie's publication embraces all the pure English words to be found in other dictionaries or employed in our oral vocabulary, and all words, not English, which by habit have grown into common use amongst us. Scottish words, which have heretofore found no place in our dictionaries, are also introduced—scientific and technical terms are given and carefully explained—Scripture terms and phrases are also included. Obsolete, obsolescent, and unusual words are distinguished—etymology and pronunciation are exhibited—and the various uses of words are illustrated by examples from the best authors. Another and very important feature is the introduction of beautifully executed diagrams and other illustrations which give a peculiar value and interest to the work. From a careful examination of the plan and execution of this vast undertaking, we are prepared to

say that it deserves to supersede all other existing authorities. The utmost vigilance appears to have been exercised in keeping clear of all doubtful or unnecessary speculations; the explanations are clear, sound, and full; the examples judiciously selected, and extensive learning is visible in the department of etymology. Dr. Ogilvie states that to Webster's addition of 12,000 words to Todd's Johnson, he has made a further addition of at least 15,000 words, terms, and phrases. The work will be completed in three volumes. Neither labour nor expense appear to have been spared in producting the first volume; and when it is complete, we believe, with the editor of the *Times*, that the "Imperial Dictionary" will be "the most elaborate and successful undertaking of the kind which has ever appepred."

Sir Theodore Broughton; or, Laurel Water. By G. P. R. James, Esq. Three Volumes. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

This is another production of what we almost believe to be an inexhaustible mine of fiction. Mr. James has ably and honestly achieved the rank and popularity he holds among the novelists of the day; and we always hail with pleasure a new work from his pen. "Sir Theodore Broughton" is inferior, in point of interest, to none of the many works of its class for which we are indebted to his untiring invention; and it is, for the most part, distinguished by the good taste and right feeling which characterise his previous works. We regret, however, that, in the story before us, he has endeavoured to enlist our sympathies in favour of an unworthy object—a military highwayman—one Colonel Luwich, who resorts to the road as a means of repairing his dilapidated fortunes. True it is that, in the way of example, it is harmless; inasmuch as a gentleman who, in those days, resorted to the same expedient, would have but a short and not over merry life of it. The moral, however, of it is—and it is not a very good one—that he wins a wreath of laurel instead of one of hemp, and so far poetical as well as magisterial, justice is defrauded of its due. For the rest, as we have said before, the plot is interesting and rather original: it abounds with vivid, vigorous, and, withal, delicate delineations of character. We very much regret the necessity thus imperatively imposed on us of qualifying our approbation of a work by one whose high personal character and kindly heart have so largely enhanced the respect which his able and generally instructive stories have won for him.

Six Letters on Dr. Todd's Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse. By E. B. DENISON, M.A. London: Painter. 1848.

DR. TODD belongs to that school of interpreters who are called Futurists, in contradistinction to those who are called Preterists—the former maintaining that all the visions of the Apocalypse relate to things that are yet future—the latter maintaining that they relate to things that are past. Both these classes of interpreters are alike disregarded by plain simple Christians, whose piety and common sense assures them that neither of these systems can possibly be true; as in either case the Church would be left for nineteen hundred years without the guidance of prophecy, and would have been treasuring up a book professedly coming from the risen Lord himself and given to the beloved disciple, the study of which was enjoined, and blessings promised to those who should hear and keep its sayings—which book, after all, would be a dead letter for the Church of eighteen centuries. Common sense rejects all such notions as a libel upon holy Scripture and a denial of the continual providence of God.

Mr. Denison, however, finding that such statements had weight with certain persons, examines Dr. Todd's book, as that which is considered the chief work in maintenance of the idea that the whole of the Apocalypse yet remains to be fulfilled. And to such of our readers as may have thought such an idea at all likely or at all tenable, we recommend Mr. Denison's refutation of it. But, to the generality of readers, it will be sufficient to say that the foundation of the whole hypothesis is a novel interpretation of the first words used by St. John when he begins the description of the Apocalyptic visions. St. John says—"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." "This (says the Futurist) does not mean, as is commonly supposed, 'I was in a state of inspiration on a certain Sunday;' but 'I was carried forward in the Spirit so as to be in the day of the Lord'—*i.e.*, the day of judgment" (49). And so all the visions of the Apocalypse are but different phases of the one day of judgment, and simultaneous—not consecutive. This gratuitous and unsupported conjecture is sufficient to make any person of common sense waste no time in examining an argument which rests on such a foundation.

Dr. Todd concludes his first lecture of objections to the received interpretations by saying—"If such interpretations, or even the principles on which they proceed, be true, the Apocalypse can be read and understood by the scholar and

man of learning only: whereas a blessing is promised to those who hear, and read, and keep the words of the prophecy" (Rev. i. 3). But, if this were true, it would apply in an infinitely greater degree to the Futurist schemes, which all assume that the Apocalypse can be understood by none, whether learned or unlearned, before the last day; so that none whatever can receive any blessing from this book. But we deny the fact, and we assert that the pious have at all times derived encouragement and strength from this book, and have discerned the character of their enemies in the antagonists of the Church therein symbolised, and have been able to appropriate to themselves the promises which are made by Christ to those that overcome and keep his works to the end.

France and its Revolutions; a Pictorial History. By G. Long, Esq. Charles Knight. Nos. I. and II.

There are in these pages some vivid and vigorous pictures of the earlier scenes of the first French Revolution. The publication of a popular history of those days is well-timed just now; and the author has avoided disputes upon unimportant matters of fact which stop the reader's progress in so many narratives of the period. The prints, too, are good; and, if the future numbers keep up the spirit of the first, we shall have a valuable addition to our popular literature.

In perusing the account of the first outbreak of the Revolution, it is actually alarming to find the good feelings and intention which existed amongst the revolutionary leaders, seeing in what they ended. The comparison of the events of those days with the events of the present exhibit many instances of a similarity more fearful in its better points than in its worst. But for the beacon afforded by past experience, we should have much reason to fear that the protests and regulations in favour of good order and government, so profusely lavished at this moment by the party leaders, would end as they ended before—in anarchy and bloodshed. We can only trust that the lessons of history thrown away upon the French kings will not be equally thrown away upon the French people.

Life and Times of the Rev. Philip Henry, M.A., Father of the Commentator. London: Nelson. 1848.

This is a very neat edition of a most interesting biography, and we are glad to find it issued at a price which places it within the reach of all but the very humblest of the reading public.

Tales of Kirkbeck, or the Parish in the Fells. London: Cleaver.

THIS is a small volume of "Tales" by the author of "Lives of Certain Fathers of the Church in the Fourth Century." The writer informs us in the preface that they are "mostly founded on truth: the only fault (it is modestly added) the reader will have to find, is the imperfection of the narrator." The stories, however, are sweetly and gracefully told, exhibiting a thorough Christian spirit and earnest mind. We cannot refrain from extracting a most touching sketch of a child's funeral:—

"Six years had passed away since that day on which the two mothers had brought their babes to the font, and the Actons had as usual returned to Kirkbeck by St. James's day; but this time it was for a different service—a service to which the other had been but a preliminary. The evening sun shone as brilliantly as it had done that day six years ago, and, as then, caused a profusion of beautiful rainbow colours to waver upon the font; the bells had rung their usual holiday peal, and even-song had been celebrated; but, when it was over, a slow deep toll proceeded from the old tower, and the vicar advanced in his surplice towards the lich-gate, where he met a little band of mourners bearing a white pulled coffin; it contained the earthly remains of that bright little one who, six years before, had been, as on this day, buried by baptism into Christ's death; and, having been planted in the likeness of his death, was now planted into the likeness of his resurrection. It was a solemn service. The burial of a little child is quite unlike all other burials: there is (thanks be to God) a certainty and reality in our assurance of its blessedness which it is difficult to grasp so surely with regard to those who have passed through the defilements of the world, although for them we have the gracious promise that to the true penitent the blood of their crucified Saviour cleanseth away all sin. But, at a child's burial, we can think of it immediately as joined to that blessed company, the 'first-fruits unto God and the Lamb, in whose mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault before the throne of God.'"

In point of composition it is vastly superior to the generality of works of the class to which it belongs. The paragraph we have quoted is a fair specimen of the style and feeling in which the work is written; and will, we think, induce many of our readers to cultivate a further acquaintance with the volume.

Female Examples, selected from the Holy Scriptures. For Young Persons. By a CLERGYMAN'S DAUGHTER. London: Hatchard.

THIS little book is admirably suited to the capacities of those for whom it is designed. The "Examples" are short; the language appropriately simple; and a spirit of piety pervades the volume.

Lays and Rhymes for the Times. London: Bell. 1848.

THE design of this little *brochure* would appear to be to afford a vehicle for the expression of the feelings of loyalty which the late feeble and foolish "Demonstration," as it is affectedly called, has evoked throughout the length and breadth of the land. Dibdin, on a larger scale, aimed at, and accomplished, a similar object among our gallant tars by his ballads. We trust that the example thus set will call forth similar efforts on the part of our lyrical writers, and we have many and able ones—Barry Cornwall in the van. To quote to any extent from the leaves before us would be to absorb the whole into our pages: for the work consists of but a few leaves. We will, however, give a specimen of the style in which it is written. It is addressed to the "Peers of England:"—

"For ye are God's high almoners; the trust, if understood—
And why are vast possessions yours—but greater means of good?
And if to you heaven's kingdom be of difficult access,
'Tis when you make that wealth your own which was but lent to bless;
Forget your office and your God, do your own will, and then,
The lesson he will teach is this, to know yourselves but men.
Be faithful stewards, practise here no tyranny but love,
And ye shall stand secure below—securer still above.
Then round the banner ye shall raise a muster'd host shall stand,
The chivalry of Europe, and the brave of every land;
And so the right shall prosper, that when such flag is furl'd,
A shout of triumph shall arise from a deliver'd world."

There are other lyrics of a more pathetic character. We have not space to quote a most spirited one by Mr. Martin Farquhar Tupper, entitled "God Preserve the Queen." We refer our readers to the work itself, which is a cheap shilling's-worth.

Madonna Pia, and Other Poems. By JAMES GREGOR GRANT. Two Vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

WE had begun to think that railroads and utilitarianism had driven poetry from the land. Wordsworth, Croly, Moore, Procter, Tennyson, Milnes, Hervey—all are silent. When we took up these volumes our audible exclamation was—"This is a bold man!" And the more we reflect on the matter the less reason we discover for revoking our opinion. He is indeed a bold man, and bold in proportion to the amount of his poetical powers, who would speculate on the sympathy of the public in an age like this. Volumes of rhyme and verse find their way to our table in sufficient abundance; but it is long—very long—since one with any-

thing like the pretensions of these before us to the high title of poetry has reached our hands. We regret that, having received the work at the eleventh hour, we have barely time or room to do more than welcome its appearance and invite attention to its merits. There are some sweetly touching passages in the principal poem, "Madonna Pia;" but these we cannot quote at sufficient length to do anything like justice to the beautiful whole. We cannot, however, forbear giving our readers a sample of the author's powers in one of the many graceful sonnets in the first volume:—

SOLITUDE.

Once more alone—alone, but not in vain
Will I endure this solitude of heart—
This doom of dragging lifeless life apart
From all of mutual mind and kindred vein.
If in such prison I must still remain,
My soul shall make medicinal the smart,
And from endurance wring the subtle art
To forge my dungeon's key from out its chain;
Or to contemn the bonds I cannot break,
Until my cell a hermitage is grown,
And my lov'd books yield purer founts to slake
That thirst to loftier natures only known.
Even as "stone walls do not a prison make,"
So 'tis not solitude to be alone."

The line which we have put in italics is very striking and original.

These volumes are very gracefully got up, and are illustrated by the pencil of Mr. Mulready. We thank Mr. Grant for the treat he has afforded us.

Essays. By THOMAS M. LESTER, late of King's College, London. London: Aylott and Jones. 1847.

IN our last number we mentioned, in terms of no ordinary encomium, a volume of "Criticisms" by a Mr. Lester. The author of the work before us, we believe, is his brother, and worthy of the relationship, albeit the "Essays" fall short of the "Criticisms" in many essential particulars. There is, probably, as much genius apparent in the one as in the other; but the "Essays" are more rhapsodical and loose in composition; and there is an affectation and over-straining in many of the epithets which greatly mar the beauty of the volume. There is no want of power or fervidness of imagination; and, if the writer be a young man, we should expect much from his more chastened judgment. A deeply religious feeling pervades the volume.

The Authorship of Junius Elucidated; including a Biographical Memoir of Lieut.-Colonel Isaac Barré, M.P. By JOHN BRITTON, F.S.A. London: Smith. 1848.

We regret that, having only received this volume at the moment of our going to press, we have neither time nor space to afford more than a brief notice of a work, which, independently of the intrinsic interest of the subject, comes recommended to us by a name so well known in archæological literature. We are glad, however, to meet him in another field; and, though we will not go the length of stating that he has succeeded in establishing the identity of Colonel Barré with the author of the "Letters of Junius," he adduces facts and arguments which give a strong colour of feasibility to his theory. Apart, however, from the aim of the writer to set at rest this vexed question of authorship, the volume contains much valuable historical and political illustration. It is carefully and gracefully got up, well embellished, and, we may add, that if the writer has not hit the mark, he is as near to it, in our opinion, as any who have shot at the same target.

The Latin Church during the Anglo-Saxon Times. By HENRY SOAMES, M.A. London: Longman and Co. 1848. 8vo.

MR. SOAMES has acquired just claims to confidence by the accuracy of reseach which characterizes all his historical publications. His earliest production was "An Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church," which formed the Bampton Lecture for 1830. That work was called forth by Dr. Lingard's "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," the misrepresentations of which were briefly exposed in the seventh volume of the *Quarterly Review*. As the Bampton Lecture was restricted to the doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Mr. Soames extended his researches, and in 1835 produced "The Anglo-Saxon Church: its History, Revenues, and General Character"—now, we are happy to state, in its third edition. This important historical work, every page of which is supported by references to unimpeachable authorities, called forth the animadversions of Dr. Lingard, in reply to whom Mr. Soames originally contemplated only the publication of a pamphlet. His work, however, has assumed its present form: and this review, of "the Latin Church during the Anglo-Saxon Times," will add to the reputation which he has justly acquired as an accurate ecclesiastical historian. The possessors of his previous volumes will doubtless procure the present work, to complete their series. But it must not be regarded

merely as a supplement to them. It is a separate and independent history, in which the author has successfully attempted to spread a knowledge of the whole Western Church during the Anglo-Saxon period; and in order that this volume may be useful to every class of readers, the authorities used in preparing it have generally been translated. Many erroneous statements of Dr. Lingard, and many false doctrines of Popery, are also incidentally and satisfactorily refuted. The following are the subjects discussed by Mr. Soames:—Gregory the Great; Conversions of the British Isles; Archbishop Theodore; Confession and Absolution; the Origin of Papal Ecclesiastical Power; Equality of the Apostles Peter and Paul; the Progress of Papal Power; Image Worship; the case of Archbishop Wilfrid; the Eucharistic Question; and "Development." Altogether, we regard this work as an important contribution to the ecclesiastical history of England, which justly claims a place in every well-selected library.

British Diplomacy in Greece. By a PHILHELLENE. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

THIS pamphlet is evidently from the pen of a man who is familiar with Greek politics, and personally acquainted, we should say, with many of the prominent actors in the events which have agitated Greece during the last twenty years. He impugns the conduct of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs as exemplified in a recently-published despatch; and defends the character and policy of the late Minister of King Otho, Koletti. This pamphlet, clearly, cleverly, and temperately written, should be in the hands of all who are interested in the politics and prosperity of Greece.

The Dying Pillow made Easy for a Death Bed. By ROBERT HAWKER, D.D. London: Collins. 1848.

THIS is put forth as a "posthumous work"—an expression which appears to us to involve a contradiction in terms—of the late vicar of Charles, Plymouth. Of the piety of Dr. Hawker there cannot be two opinions—of the soundness of his doctrines there are many; and we are among those who differ from him on several doctrinal, though, it may be, not practical, points. The *questio vexata* has been so often discussed, and by abler pens than ours, that we shall be excused from entering into the wide field to which an examination of the work before us would introduce us. It is, doubtless, a welcome legacy to the admirers of the author.

The Complete Concordance to Shakspere; being a Verbal Index to the Passages in the Dramatic Works of the Poet. By Mrs. Cowden Clarke. London: Charles Knight. 1847.

The name of the lady authoress that heads this notice is familiar to many readers, while we also recognise that of her husband, Charles Cowden Clarke, as the gentleman who gave us, some years ago, the elegant edition of "Chaucer Modernized."

The authoress observes in her preface that "Shakspere—the most frequently quoted, because the most universal-minded genius that ever lived of all authors—best deserves a complete concordance to his works." Sixteen years' assiduous labours have been devoted to this task, which, while it was evidently "a labour of love," as the lady expresses it, was also intended to make up for the defects of former writers, particularly her predecessors, Twiss and Ayscough; and we have it before us in a printed state, and, truly, to contemplate it, we cannot but congratulate Mrs. Clarke upon its completion.

Mrs. Clarke's own words best explain to the reader the most striking and useful qualities of the work. "To what subject (she asks) may we not with felicity apply a motto from this greatest of poets? The divine—commending the efficacy and force of prayer—'to be forestalled, ere we come to fall; or, pardoned, being down:' the astronomer, supporting his theory by allusions to the 'moist star, upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands,'" &c. &c.

Shakspere! What a great, what a magical name—almost as potent as ever was his own noble *Prospero*. How wondrous must his young life have been by the Avon—what communings must this young prophet have held with nature in solitude and in silence, while this said nature became to him a sublime goddess at whose feet he sat with upturned face, his earnest soul looking out of his radiant eyes, listening in love and wonder to the mysteries that were unfolded to him! What must that early life have been to him, so full of grandeur, as yet shrouded in gloom—chaos struggling to merge into creation and form—while he sauntered heedlessly in noon and twilight on those pleasant slopes! Within the narrow circumference of his life *then*, he created for himself a new world full of the sublime and the beautiful; and, from the depth of his struggling soul, where, as if wrestling wrathfully to find voice, there came forth those stormy groanings which at last had sonorors utterances, changed into wild Memnonian melodies that swelled upward, and sang forth, out of his deep human heart—some grand and august, as *Coriolanus* and *Julius*

Cæsar—others terrible, as the anguish of *Lear* or the tremendous throes of *Macbeth*—others, again, as gentle as the dying moans of *Ophelia* or the broken sobbings of *Cordelia!*

And this man, as has been finely said, was "not for an age, but for all time." About him was no individuality—no style, no egotism, no *prestige*—nothing that you could call peculiar or marked was to define this peculiarity: he was a human being of a great cast of mind, with an ubiquitous power and capability that encountered every obstacle, overleaped every opposition, and crushed every difficulty into dust, before him. He spoke no new truths; but he was the voice of a truth indivisible, unalterable, eternal! He created nothing, so to speak; but he used the old matter that he found already existing, and it became plastic under his skilful hand. He invested men with attributes that startled the world by their aptitude, their reality, and their grandeur; he made the old truths speak out like new—old doctrines, old manners, old customs, which had grown despised and thread-bare, because men gave them no heed—rather affected to despise them—these he made to speak out in other mode, so that unbelief changed into belief, and men imagined at first that they saw some fragments of a diviner utopia floating around the space: like the harmless atoms of *Democritus*, he made men *think*, and then they drew their own inference, which pointed to all that was good, great, noble, and worthy of man.

It is with pleasure that we hail all books that have any relation with Shakspere—be they even so weak as to become pitiable, which, after all, is not often the case; but what can we say when a lady, whose literary abilities are so well known as those of Mrs. Cowden Clarke, appears before us? It is very true that the literary—that is the *æsthetic*—merits of a concordance can necessarily not be great; and this is neither designed nor expected: it is the gigantic labour and the patient endurance—the perseverance and correctness—that astonish us: the skill and aptitude with which, upon examining here and there, we discover in this really immense undertaking, the value of which can only be appreciated by its use, and that use will soon be acknowledged by both student and critic.

Of its beautiful typography, as it has appeared in serial parts, the public, to some extent, may already be the judges. We have only to recommend it most warmly to all the admirers of the great poet, and to hope that the expense incidental on the production of such a work may be returned with multiplied amplitude.

The Prize—The Hospital—The Singing Lessons—The Elder Children—A Village Story—The Friends. London: Mozley.

THESE are reprints from the "Magazine for the Young;" and we take too deep an interest in whatever is printed for the amusement and instruction of children not to read these little books, trifles though they are, with much earnest attention. Our critical duties enforce upon us all subjects, and the last we would neglect or lightly esteem are the tales now so plentifully provided by the press for very young children. We can report very favourably of the tales whose titles we have quoted. They are highly interesting and very pleasing tales of village life, told in very good and simple language, and have each a moral which the young mind can easily comprehend.

The "Prize" is a sweet little tale, of which the characters may be seen in every well-conducted village school in the kingdom. "Maurice Favell, or the Singing Lessons," is but the experience of half the present race of curates and vicars in the kingdom. "The Primrose, or the Elder Sisters," fully explains why some village girls turn out so well in life, and others, with the same advantages, so ill. "Phœbe, or the Hospital," is a tale of great interest, and we could scarcely love the child who, while reading it, did not shed a tear over it. "The Village Story" and "The Friends" are for well-grown girls rather than babes; and the first is a thrilling story, which keeps the attention alive throughout, and is exceedingly well told from beginning to end. "The Friends" is tame in comparison; but we can strongly recommend those we have named as excellent and useful little works for home perusal or parochial distribution, and should certainly read with a favourable bias others from the same publishers.

A Concise History of the Hampden Controversy. By the Rev. HENRY CHRISTMAS, M.A., F.R.S., S.A. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

WITHOUT pretending to enter into this *quæstio vexata*, which has already been discussed *usque ad nauseam*, we may venture to recommend this publication chiefly on account of its embodying, *in extenso*, most of the documents and letters which are scattered through the columns of the daily press, and which, in their collected form, constitute a sort of "handbook" on the subject. Mr. Christmas is a partizan, but not a violent one; and, on the whole, as far as his own opinions are concerned, he has acquitted himself of his task with as much impartiality as could be reasonably expected in a controversy of such a nature.

Bamfield on the Organization of Industry: a Course of Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge, in Easter Term, 1844. Longman and Co. London.

THE writings of Malthus, Adam Smith, Ricardo, Maculloch, Say, Louis Blanc, and others, have originated in this day a number of new and original thinkers, who, leaving the track of the more theoretic writers, venture boldly into calculations upon the practical part of political and social economy; and truly at this, perhaps, there is more real necessity for clever and lucid works on the subject than we seem to have *actually* required for many years past.

The continental economists, in the instances of St. Simon, Fourier, and lastly Louis Blanc (as some of our own also), have given to their political theories a mischievous impulse, by means of fine and fervid writings which can be no defence for sophistry, and which must not be allowed to clothe the real doctrines of which they have become propagandists; and it is with no less satisfaction than pleasure that we witness books, like the present, coming from clear and calm-sighted men, who, having studied the important question, come forward and point out where such theories are wrong or deficient.

The date of these lectures is also not so far back but that they may be applicable to the present crisis. As a kind of text from which he argues, his second proposition is, "M. Hermann's adoption of the *relations that grow up between man and man* is a portion of the wealth and capital both of individuals and of nations," by which he recognises "the economical value of the family and of the national ties."

In this repudiation of the doctrines which equalize all grades of labour and which seeks to lower intellectual superiority—which strikes at emulation—that source of new inventions and the spur and incentive to undertakings which have made England's merchants and manufacturers of kin to the princely mercantile establishments of Tyre and Sidon—we see that wise conservation which keeps back the audacious innovations of those who, having nothing to lose, wish to gain at the cost of others. It is always well to apply intelligence against that ambition which is based upon an unprincipled desire to drag down to their own level rather than seek to elevate by proper means and by right subjection—thus striking at the root of order, and substituting a flimsy organization of labour which shackles both master and workman: also disorganizing the existing state of things, which to some extent may be bad, but is easier made worse than bettered.

Speaking of association, in objection to Fourier and Owen, he states that "the aim of association is to obtain and secure

individual liberty. Thus associations stand, in some measure, in the same relation to freedom that capital does to income"—that is to say, that the one, by a spontaneous consequence and of necessity, produces the other—an ingenious but also a palpable deduction. He proceeds—"Association is but a means wherewith to attain the end—individual freedom of action and enjoyment."

While wealth and capital fluctuate in unrestricted liberty, like the great tidal waves, all portions of the land and its communities are benefited. Where could the advantage be to any distant district, if the wealth there produced and elaborated never came to them in the shape of new speculations and bolder undertakings—if the capital requisite for it was invested in one sole head—if it never flowed, like another Pactolus, across the country, from north to south and from east to west? It is the freedom of competitive enterprize which, all of a sudden, raises up the population of a suburb, or of a village or rural district, from its still and sordid poverty, into a new life, when factories raise their heads. Workshops, machinery, and all the busy "hum of labour" waken the people from their depression. In a few months' time you see a busy air hath overspread all and each, from the cotter to the shopkeeper—men become important and valuable—and the raw material which slumbered in the mine, or which whitened the plantations of America, as well as the uncultured intelligence, become in both instances literally manufactured. The rise of a small unnoticed district into a "working" importance is a thing of the deepest interest to consider. The politician recognize its existence; and what was only a mere figure in the census is then raised into importance. The factory (of any kind) is built—the church is founded—the school is established, and the electric touch of capital, unrestricted in its operation, gives life to these dry bones, adding another *point d'appui* to the industrial resources of the country.

The work is written with perspicuity and force—the logical acumen is clearly visible—and that he possesses an accurate knowledge of his subject is guaranteed, not only by the fact of these lectures being delivered to so learned a body with the concurrence of the Professor of Political Economy of the University and the Vice-Chancellor, but also by a long residence in central Europe, where the workings of our political economy at home can be observed, and its consequences, there, more minutely followed. We confidently commend this work, therefore, to the attention of all who are interested in these important questions of the day, and they are all.

Excerpta Protestantia; comprising a View of the Church of England in the Aspect of her Articles and Homilies, and of her Antagonism to the Church of Rome. Hatchard. 1848.

THE title sufficiently explains the nature of this little volume, the extracts being chiefly from the homilies, and works like Nowell's Catechism, or such as are held in equally high estimation. But there are many original remarks on the difficulty of meeting the errors of Rome from the novel and ever-varying aspect which so many of these errors assume; for they require us to bring positive proof that doctrines have been condemned by the primitive Church, when the pure minds of the early fathers could not have conceived the possibility of such corruptions creeping in or being for an instant tolerated. The doctrine of indulgences is an innovation. "That the doctrine is a late device of that Church, the perfect silence of antiquity in the whole matter is an abundant demonstration...in fact, there is no one writer of any credit or authority who ever took notice of it; but it was a doctrine wholly unknown to the Church for about one thousand two hundred years after Christ" (107). "Now, although the ancient fathers of the Church could not be supposed to speak in direct terms against this new doctrine of indulgences because in their day it was not in existence, yet they have said many things which perfectly destroy it" (108).

In like manner, purgatory, intercession of saints, prayer for the dead, adoration of the host, solitary mass, communion in one kind, &c. are innovations which stand on just the same footing.

Adventures of an Aide-de-Camp; or, a Campaign in Calabria. By JAMES GRANT, Esq. Three Volumes. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

THERE is so much of stirring incident and adventure in these volumes, that we wonder that the author, in this book-making age, had not husbanded his abundant materials and diffused them over two three-volume works instead of one. The popularity achieved by his former book, "The Romance of War," would have warranted the experiment; and the reader would have had no reason to complain of lack of interest. The character of an ubiquitous hunchback, though not very original in conception, is felicitously drawn, and introduced with great effect. The hero is equally conspicuous as a soldier and a lover; but, as he is faithful in each capacity, we have no objection to urge to the combination. It is full of graphic, and occasionally poetic, power.

My Sister Minnie. By Mrs. Mackenzie Daniel. Three Vols. London: Newby, 1848.

This is not what is termed a religious novel—a class of fictions for which we have no especial regard, since, in nine cases out of ten, they do mischief: in fact, a novel is the very last medium which a really pious writer would choose for the inculcation of religious truth. There is, however, in these volumes a recognition of religious principles which we should be glad oftener to find among works of the class. Some of our most successful writers of fiction—we mean successful in reference to their popularity—appear quite ignorant of the plainest and most familiar doctrines of Christianity; and it is, therefore, not surprising that the *moral* tendency of their productions is sometimes worse than equivocal. The plot of "My Sister Minnie" is ingeniously conceived, and cleverly developed, and the story is gracefully and effectively told. If there be no great elevation of thought or power of language in these volumes, they are free from affectation and display much sound sense and right feeling. They will be read with interest by those who affect this class of literature, and it will be their own fault if they derive not some profit, as well as amusement, from these pages.

The Master and his Servants: an Allegory. By the Rev. W. H. Ridley, A.M. London: Edwards.

Written in a Christian and kindly spirit, and with a simplicity of diction which will especially commend itself to the young, for whose edification we presume it is chiefly designed. We are generally averse to *allegory* as a means of inculcating religious truths: it comes to us, we know, with the sanction of the highest example; but we must remember that "He spake as never man spake." The work before us, however, is as little open to objection as any of its class we have met with; and, for the rest, we think it well calculated to promote the pious object of the reverend writer.

Emmeline; or Good Humour. By Mrs. E. Smith. London: Whittaker. 1847.

With a somewhat namby-pamby dedication and no especial display of talent in the composition, this is a story with the tendency of which it is impossible to find fault. It has a pendant in the shape of a ballad on "The Fortunes of Mary Stewart," which has nothing poetical belonging to it but the rhymes.

Tales for the Times. No. I.—The Young Protestant; or, The Compass of Land and Sea to make one Proselyte. By a CLERGYMAN. Seeleys. London. 1848.

FICTION, as we have more than once had occasion to remark in this publication, may illustrate much, but can prove nothing. Verisimilitude is, however, essential to illustration, and that feature is wanting in the "Young Protestant." His father is tried for killing his wife. The coroner's jury bring in a verdict of "manslaughter:" he is subsequently tried at the sessions and found guilty; but, on the recommendation of the jury, is released by an order of the judge, his previous imprisonment being considered a sufficient punishment for his offence. We are not likely to be suspected of any inordinate admiration of the Roman priesthood; but we are bound, in common charity, to protest against the making a human devil a type of the class. "Fair play is a jewel," says a homely proverb—and this is a very one-sided affair.

The Last Day. London: Nisbet. 1847. Third Edition.

WE spoke in terms of high praise of this admirable little book on its first appearance. We are glad to find that our judgment has been confirmed by the approbation of the public—a fact evidenced by the work having reached a third edition. It is a sweet book.

Sermons on Practical Subjects. By the Rev. S. WARREN, LL.D., Incumbent of All Souls', Manchester. Blackwood. 1848.

"PRACTICAL utility, rather than novelty or research, is the object proposed by the author of the following sermons: he has, therefore, purposely abstained from an abstruse and metaphysical manner of treating the subjects contained in them. This is mentioned to prevent disappointment on the part of some, who might otherwise expect in this volume what they will be sure not to find" (Preface).

The sermons are twenty-five, and they are well suited for reading in families.

The Thirty-nine Articles no Test of Heresy. London: Masters, 1848.

THIS small pamphlet purports to be a brief examination of a pamphlet by the Rev. William Goode, entitled "A Defence of the Thirty-nine Articles." We must refer those who are curious on the subject of the controversy to the publication itself; we have not room to discuss it.

A Brief Sketch of Human Nature in Innocency. By the Rev. W. Gurden Moore, M.A. London: Painter. 1848.

This little volume, by the Vicar of Aslackby, Lincolnshire, is introduced to us in a very modest and sensible preface. The subject, in itself highly interesting, is ably, and, in some respects, originally treated. The book reflects great credit on the learning and piety of the author.

The Gospel of Christ the Power of God unto Salvation. By the Rev. W. A. Newman, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

This is a series of twelve "Illustrations," inscribed by the author, the Curate of St. Georges', Wolverhampton, to his flock, from whom he is about to be separated; and a more appropriate or valuable parting gift could not be bestowed upon them. It is eloquently and gracefully written, and altogether a superior volume of sermons.

A Pilgrimage to Rome: containing some account of the High Ceremonies, the Monastic Institutions, the Religious Services, the Sacred Relics, the Miraculous Pictures, and the general State of Religion in that City. By the Rev. M. H. Seymour, M.A. London: Seeleys. 8vo. 1848.

This important work came under our notice too late to admit of our giving an analysis of its deeply-interesting contents. While the majority of travellers to Rome are, naturally enough, occupied with surveying the remains of ancient art, and the exquisite paintings of the greatest masters of modern time, Mr. Seymour (than whom few clergymen are better acquainted with the doctrinal system of errors maintained by the modern Church of Rome), employed himself, during a residence of several months, in a minute examination of the practical working of Papacy. The result of his patient and accurate researches is comprised in the present elegantly-executed work, to which we propose to call the attention of our readers in the ensuing volume of our journal. At present, we need only remark that it fills up a most important chasm in the numerous descriptions of Rome, which, of late years, have issued from the press.

London: W. E. Painter, *Church and State Gazette* Office, 342, Strand.

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, MDCCCXLVIII.

ART. I.—*Sacred Annals; or, Researches into the History and Religion of Mankind, from the Creation to the Death of Isaac: deduced from the Writings of Moses and other Inspired Authors; and illustrated by Copious References to the Ancient Records, Traditions, and Mythology of the Heathen World.* By GEORGE SMITH, F.S.A., &c. Longmans. 1847.

THE present, which so far outstrips all former ages in activity and rapid progress, is an age which has also distinguished itself by the importance of many of its discoveries, both in regard to the unexpected light cast thereby upon some of the darkest points in the past history of the world, and in the superior accuracy which this has been the means of imparting to our general knowledge, so as to render a revision of all our old ideas on sacred history and chronology imperatively necessary to every student of theology. But we do not mean to advert on this occasion to more than two of these discoveries in an especial manner, the one belonging to ancient history, the other to science in general: both being, however, characteristic of the progress we allude to and both peculiarly the boast of modern times—we mean the decyphering of the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the observed order of stratified rocks throughout the world; for the Egyptian monuments are regarded as affording the means of determining the chronology of one of the oldest families of mankind, and geology is supposed to furnish data by which we may

be able approximately to calculate the catastrophes, if not also the age, of the earth itself.

These discoveries force upon our attention some enquiry concerning the grounds of the supposed antiquity of the earth, and the nature of those convulsions of which it is asserted we have the evidence, and concerning the origin or early dispersion and various fortunes of its successive inhabitants, as they have a direct bearing upon the facts recorded in holy Scripture, and, therefore, affect the foundations of our faith: and Egyptian chronology is so interwoven with that of the posterity of Abraham as to render the study of it indispensable to the right understanding of the Jewish history, and also of peculiar and paramount importance in these latter ages of the world.

And all these studies advance in dignity as they enlarge in extent, being in a ratio corresponding to the increase of the materials for prosecuting them with exactness, and to the importance of their bearings and results. It also requires in the student greater enlargement of mind to embrace the many various particulars which must be taken into consideration, and greater care in accurately adjusting each particular in its true place, since the misplacing any one fact in a complicated system will occasion a far greater disturbance and dislocation of the whole, and a wider deviation from the truth, than the same amount of error where the parts are not so nicely adjusted, or which may be naturally incidental to a ruder and less intimately connected system of things: indeed, so complicated and so difficult do we regard some of these enquiries as to entertain a doubt whether any one man can thoroughly master all the various subjects which are involved therein; so obliging every one to depend in part upon the results which others have laboured to obtain, and to take certain things on trust from those who have investigated that branch of the subject; since it is vain to expect in any one man capacity or time for the thorough investigation of all the points in such complicated enquiries. We must at all times take something on trust from others, and the number or amount of the things which we are so obliged to receive is continually increasing as investigations multiply, and as men attain and expect in others so much greater precision.

But in every case it is obvious that the results of all investigations must depend, in a very great degree, upon the method we may determine to adopt at the commencement of our enquiries, and the data which we therefore assume and take for our basis: and it resolves itself into the credibility of various kinds of evidence, and the degree of weight which we attach to

the several kinds of proof, for we have certain traditions and historical records on the one hand and certain existing monuments or phenomena on the other hand; and, in combining these, we run the risk of warping the one or the other kind of evidence if we do not exactly and correctly apprehend the meaning of both. Credulity may attach too much importance to tradition and may disregard or falsify the evidence of existing monuments; while a blind reliance on these last alone will result in still greater errors, not only because it is not possible to understand the monuments without the light of history, but because they only carry us up to a time when tradition is our only guide, and of which tradition the oldest monuments are but the record or embodiment.

Regarding the origin and early history of any one nation or family of mankind, we can know nothing but by means of traditions handed down amongst them concerning the founders of their race; for, however high we may endeavour to carry the documentary and monumental history of any people, it only lands us at a period of time when they first began to think it worth while to record, in some durable form, the exploits of their ancestors, which had hitherto been remembered only as the subject of old men's tales or in the songs of the bards. The mere existence of monuments proves that the people among whom they exist have passed through the first stages of society, and are no longer contending with the elements or with barbarous tribes for a place and a name: it implies a settled habitation, a desire to perpetuate it, and co-operation for the common weal; but every such people has passed through its periods of migration and conflict before there can be materials and scope for that presiding genius which should give fixity to its institutions and importance to its history, and so become the hero or demigod of that people: and, when the historic epoch arrives, all the common-place incidents of the earlier periods have been forgotten, and we find nothing recorded, save those mythic legends which had floated down the stream of popular tradition, and had become more or less extravagant just as the national taste inclined more or less towards the romantic and fabulous.

The mythic legends concerning Isis and Osiris in Egypt, or concerning Hercules and Cadmus in Greece, had probably some such foundation as the history of our own Arthur, or that of the "Seven Champions of Christendom," recited by the minstrels for the edification of our ancestors. There was a slender basis of fact upon which they raised a fantastic superstructure in accordance with the taste prevailing in those dark ages. The wildness of a legend is no evidence of its absolute antiquity;

it only proves that it originated in a rude and ignorant state of society; and, when these fables have taken hold of a people, men either cannot or dare not shake them off entirely when they grow better informed; so that it becomes impossible for us—who have only dead languages and lifeless monuments for our guides—to separate the fabulous from the real, or to determine how much is merely mythic in the Sesostris of Egypt and the Theseus of Greece in later times, and how much is to be really attributed to the Pharaoh and the man. Nay, so far are the real and the fabulous blended together on the friezes and pediments of the Parthenon, and on the sculptures of the Egyptian tombs and temples to the latest times, that all of them, from first to last, obviously require to be taken as records *cum grano salis.*

In striking contrast to all those heathen traditions stands the narrative of Moses, which, although historically older than any other record and recounting the very first beginnings of all things, is yet characterised by a simplicity and reality which we at once apprehend and acquiesce in, leaving upon the mind an impression of its *vraisemblance* which would commend it to acceptance, even if it had no other claims to our regard; for Moses, though he was the earliest of known writers, himself lived far down in the stream of time, and long after Egypt had settled itself into a great empire, and when the temples and monuments, to which we have referred, were many of them in process of erection. And no natural reason can be assigned for exempting Moses from the temptations to mystify and exaggerate under which all those of his age, and especially the Egyptians among whom he had been bred, had lain and to which they all had yielded; and supposing Moses, like the rest of mankind, to have derived his information from tradition, no natural reason can be given why the Jewish traditions alone should be free from that exaggeration and fable which we find, without exception, in the traditions of every other ancient people.

Moreover, the writings of Moses treat of things which he could not learn by tradition, because they are things that mount higher than tradition reaches and are beyond the powers—beyond the knowledge of mankind; for this book treats of the origin of the world itself before man was called into existence, and that a world far otherwise conditioned than we now behold it—a world untainted by sin and very good—a world which had not undergone the baptism of the deluge, which has so greatly changed its universal aspect: nay, more, it treats even of the counsels and purposes of God, and wherefore all these things

were made, and all the changes wrought; and teaches us that, notwithstanding the fall and all its consequences, the counsels of God shall yet be fully developed, and are even now progressing towards that accomplishment which they shall at length attain in the restitution of all things, or the kingdom of Christ, as we learn especially from the citation of Genesis in the eighth Psalm, expounded by St. Paul in his epistle to the Hebrews.

Nothing less than divine revelation will suffice to account for these peculiarities in the writings of Moses. God alone knew —God alone could make known—in what manner and for what end he made the world; and God enabled Moses to record these, his acts and purposes, with all simplicity; while its superiority as a mere history of things that might have been received by tradition is to be ascribed to the same cause as its account of things which, from their very nature, could be only known to God. The Mosaic history all holds together as one consistent whole: every part of it stands on the same footing of inspiration: it is one volume revealing for our instruction the manner of creation, and the purpose which God had in view from the beginning, and carrying on the history of mankind with continual reference to the accomplishment of this purpose through the overruling providence of God. Some acquaintance with these things is necessary for all men—all men are interested in them, and especially as Christians does this instruction become necessary to us; for the several facts thus made known are taken up in the New Testament, and are made fundamental articles of our faith, without the knowledge and belief of which we should not have been Christians. The long line of worthies in St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews is introduced with the declaration that "*through faith* we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (xi. 3). And writing to the Ephesians, concerning the creation of man and woman, the same apostle saith—"This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church" (v. 32). So also Christ is regarded as "the last Adam," and as the recoverer of all that we lost through the sin of our first parent (1 Cor. xv. 22, 45). And St. Peter regards it as a wilful sin, and characteristic of the scoffers of the last days, that any should be ignorant of the facts of the world's creation and of its destruction by the deluge, as recorded in the writings of Moses; or should not know that the world which now is stands reserved for another purpose which shall be accomplished in the day of the Lord: even the bringing in

of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness (2 Pet. iii. 3, 13).

We are, therefore, constrained, both by reason and by religion, to make the holy Scriptures the basis of any enquiry into the early history of mankind, if we would keep clear of exaggeration and fable and walk in the obedience of faith; and we are glad to find that the author of the work before us has been led by such considerations as these to make holy Scripture the groundwork of his investigations, and has resolved to bring all the fragments of ancient history which remain into comparison with this standard, to ascertain their degree of truth, testing them by it, not it by them: it being the truth itself—other records liable to exception:—

"His first and ruling idea was to arrive at the TRUTH respecting the origin and early history of the human race. Two reasons induced him to make the Bible his text-book throughout the enquiry: first, he saw that, in reference to several important topics, no light could possibly be obtained except through divine revelation; this is the case with regard to the origin of mankind, the divine purpose respecting the human race, and man's future destiny. On these subjects, if any information is attainable, it must be through explicit communications from the Author and Governor of the universe. Secondly, the volume of inspiration is the only source of information which we know to be unalloyed by error and unadulterated by fiction. For these reasons the scriptural account has been regarded as of paramount authority" (vi.)

The Scriptures, moreover, help to explain and reconcile many of the heathen traditions, which, if merely compared with each other, would seem to be irreconcileable and contradictory. Many of these traditions are, in fact, deviations in opposite directions from the simple matter of fact; and many learned men have undertaken to show in what manner some of the most repulsive of the rites and superstitions of the heathen, which have been very widely spread and have been practised among distinct races of mankind, may still have been derived through corrupted channels from things which are found recorded in Scripture; and they have thus turned these multifarious errors into a corroboration of the truth by constrasting them with the straightforward simplicity of that authentic history which has been so perverted. We allude to such works as Deane's serpent worship and the numerous publications by Faber, Bryant, and others: all of which writings tend to prove that in the heathen traditions there are some vestiges of truth, and that these all lead to the Scriptures as the genuine source from whence, diverging on the one hand or the other, men have been

carried, by their corrupt inclinations, into all the extremes we behold of superstition and idolatry.

The materials on which Deane, Faber, and Bryant had to work were ably employed by them for the purposes which they had in view, and perhaps, we may say, were well nigh exhausted; but fresh materials are come to light since their day, and are continually turning up in the new fields of research which our contemporaries are so actively engaged in exploring; and in all these new regions of investigation it is of the utmost importance, both for the interests of truth and of religion, that men should carry with them the conviction that these new materials will prove fresh bulwarks to the citadel of our faith and labour to turn them to this good account; for, not only do men see first and most distinctly that which they are expecting and looking for, but even in science we find the same divergencies of error as in all other matters where man is relying upon himself and his own individual judgment. Of course, we do not mean to infer that the facts of science are matters of inspiration, or that scientific investigations depend upon the presence or absence of faith; but this we do mean to say, that the man who has lived in a Christian land and has thus had the means of informing himself correctly on religious matters, and after all remains irreligious, affords in the fact an evidence that his judgment is not to be trusted in anything, for he must have an ill-balanced mind; and, having proved himself incapable of taking a broad and comprehensive view of the most momentous question on which the mind of man can be engaged, we become sure that his judgment on matters of minor importance will be still more erroneous—will be perverted by the narrow and partial views of the facts, distorted to support some false hypothesis by inconclusive reasoning. The intolerant and persecuting spirit which usually accompanies infidelity has often been noticed; but it is not commonly remarked that it generally springs from a narrowness of mind and a mixture of envy and rage against those who possess a treasure, the value of which infidels are unable to comprehend.

Schleiden, in his "Lectures on Botany," asserts that man only attains to something great when he, from the beginning, takes the highest object, the unattainable ideal, for his aim. At first a man may fancy that it is easy to satisfy such a demand, but it is certain that very little of what they depict is attained to by individual men. The false conclusion commonly drawn from this is, that far less depends upon an accurate knowledge of our aim than on the activity with which we strive towards it, though it may be only ideal. But (he justly observes) two

essentially different positions are here confounded, and error is introduced thereby; for, while on earth, men are to be regarded in two aspects, and a double claim is made on their mental activity and development—the first concerning the moral being or religious element in man, the second regarding his mental or scientific culture—the two may interpenetrate and mutually support each other; but their origin, their inner essence, is wholly distinct, and they have an infinitely different import—consequently, an infinitely different value for mankind. The first, the ethico-religious development, relates to the eternal, the incorruptible part of man—his immortal soul, consequently to the proper, never-ceasing, I. Here an universal and necessary claim is made on *every* man: it is the point where all are alike before God with equal rights and equal burdens; and truly equal, because the simplest self-understanding suffices to the object, and may comprehend and express the ideal perfectly and purely. The most important of all things for the individual is to answer that ideal, and thus to legitimate his position as a man in the nobler sense of the word—as a being destined to a higher completion and eternal existence. Without this legitimation he has no right to respect, to acknowledgment of any kind, even though he have ascended to ever so high a stage in reference to the point next to be mentioned. The second claim made upon mankind relates, on the other hand, to his culture for his circumscribed position on earth. Here the object is to raise every bodily and mental power of our nature to a state of perfect culture, in order to facilitate and ensure the attainment of the first-named object. To this belongs all sciences, which, be they valued highly or lowly among men in general, stand in one and the same condition of nothingness, inasmuch as their importance ceases with life, and they have worth and value only here, on this little sun-mote, our earth. A man may have accomplished great things here, but he has not the lowest claim to any respect or recognition if he have not obeyed the higher claims of morally religious culture.

This is well expressed, and we only complain of Schleiden, and other men of science, when they disappoint all the expectations which the literal understanding of the words they use is calculated to raise: for, taking it to be granted that the religious standard is the only true estimate of man's character, and that the Bible furnishes those rules of conduct and presents those objects of faith by which alone the religious standing can be attained—and taking it for granted that all scientific culture is "in order to facilitate and ensure the attainment of the first-named object"—namely, our moral perfection—then will the

means proceed hand in hand throughout, and faith, in a subordinate degree, be the accompaniment of the subordinate or scientific training to ensure the higher or moral object, where faith has its full and legitimate exercise. For, as we can confessedly know nothing concerning the invisible world, and heaven, and the Almighty, save those things which he has been pleased to reveal, so in the visible things with which science has made us conversant, and the material elements around us, there are mysteries which we cannot fathom, but must equally refer to God, and believe what has been revealed in Scripture without desiring to go further. We may safely pronounce the human body to be the noblest portion of the material universe that can engage our attention, seeing it is the casket which enshrines the immortal soul, and the instrument through which alone the soul itself can be fitted for heaven, or can become the channel for imparting spiritual blessings to others. And, being our own body too, we may be presumed to have a more intimate cognizance of it than of any other portion of matter: yet how little do we know of this? And touching the most interesting point of all, the resurrection of the body, science would leave us in utter ignorance at the best, and many of its conclusions might even tend to bear out the bold sceptic who would wish to deny the possibility of a resurrection. But here faith comes to our aid; and that a faith not only in the doctrines, but in the facts, contained in Scripture, for the resurrection of Christ is one of the best established facts upon record: and, as it was in the very same body that he arose from the dead, bearing in his hands and his side the marks of his passion, so we are instructed in Scripture to receive this fact as the token and pledge that these identical bodies we wear, although mortal and corruptible, shall be raised immortal and incorruptible, and that the resurrection of Christ shall be still more closely paralleled in those that are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord, whose vile bodies shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and, without passing through death, shall be fashioned like unto the glorious body of their Lord. We believe all this, though science cannot take a step to prove it: and we who live after the Incarnation, with holy Job who lived so long before his coming, confess in faith, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand, at the latter day, upon the earth: and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

There is also another aspect in which the sacred history

should be regarded which corroborates all the above, and shews, on other grounds, the necessity of believing in the Scriptures as given by divine inspiration—they present to the Church types and examples. In this respect sacred history differs entirely from all other histories; for other historians merely record passing events, which may or may not be instructive, and on which we form our own opinions, walking in the footsteps of the wise and avoiding the course of the foolish. Such lessons as these the Scriptures furnish in rich abundance, and in common with every other kind of history; but the types and examples to which we allude are of another and far higher kind; for the history of the creation and of man as recorded in Scripture, and the vicissitudes which both had experienced before the coming of Christ—the history likewise of all that Christ did and suffered while on earth, of his resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God, and the history of the first planting of the Church by his immediate followers—are all parts of one plan, are all inseparably connected, and have all been recorded and transmitted to us for one and the same purpose. The memory of these things has not been thus faithfully preserved for the mere purpose of gratifying man's curiosity, however laudable that curiosity may be; nor yet for preventing the dangers which might arise from our being led away by false accounts thereof has the truth been made known in these matters. The Scriptures have been given for the far higher end of showing that all things had been working from the beginning to prepare the way of the Lord as surely as John the Baptist was his forerunner, and had been pointed out as about to come in that character by the prophet Isaiah, according to the concurrent testimony of all the four evangelists (Matt. iii., Mark i., Luke iii., John i. 23); and that all these preparations, and all the acts of Christ and the apostles, concentrate upon, and terminate in, the Christian Church of which we are members, and were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

This is a most pregnant consideration if we regard it aright —that is, if we consider its full force, and all its manifold bearings. But we are so accustomed to vague ascriptions of divine power to Christ on the one hand, and so continually attribute whatever is wrought in the Church to the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit on the other hand, as to leave out of our consideration that element of Godhead which is common to the three Persons of the blessed Trinity, but is more especially the attribute of the Father—namely, foreseeing the end from the beginning; and *that* as to the time and manner as well as the result. The Scriptures carefully preserve these distinctions;

as, for instance, in the commencement of the epistle to the Hebrews—"God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds." God the Father is represented as the Speaker, whether by the prophets of old or by his Son our Lord; and God the Father is represented as creating all things by the Son, who is constituted heir of all things which he hath made. And further on it is said, in the same epistle, that "It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." Yet we know also that it is by the Holy Ghost that we are sanctified; and that by the same Spirit who is called the Spirit of Christ the prophets spake, and that to them "it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister those things...with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into" (1 Peter i. 12). So also in the epistle to the Colossians, thanks are given to the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, by whom and for whom all things were created; who is before all things, and by whom all things consist; and who is the Head of the body, the Church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence: for it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. Thus we see that in the creation an end was contemplated which was to be ultimately attained by means of Christ Jesus, and to become manifested in the Church —that Christ is the end in being the Head of the Church, as he was the beginning in being the Creator of all things; and in this sense is the Alpha and Omega, the Author and Finisher of our faith—that this purpose and plan has been the one subject of revelation, the Spirit of God interpreting each step towards its accomplishment which God in his providence was taking from time to time; and that the heavenly hosts are watching with intense interest every fresh development of the Redeemer's love, and on each occasion sing anew the song of glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will towards men.

Hence it follows that as we believe in Christ, and as we belong to the Christian Church, so must we hold fast our faith in what Christ hath wrought in our behalf from the beginning—that is,

in first forming that world which he afterwards redeemed, and being the Author of the old creation as well as of the new; and especially so in regard to man himself, who, in becoming regenerate, is renewed after the image of him that created him in righteousness and true holiness: and the determinate plan having been fixed before hand in the counsels of the Most High was not left to chance on the one hand, nor placed under a dry machinery of formal unalterable laws on the other; but its administration has been kept in the hands of God, and is so ordered by Divine Providence that angels and men can discern the continual superintendence of the Almighty, and yet see that it is a rule of love, and obey the commands of God from affection and choice, and not from a servile fear or under the compulsion of a stern necessity, from which they would fain escape if it were possible. It is faith working by love that binds the heart to God; but without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. And the evidence that God superintends and sustains the ordinary course of things by the secret workings of his providence is afforded by the extraordinary things which do from time to time occur, and which have been declared before hand to the faithful among mankind, together with the reasons for these interferences, to encourage them in the path of duty, and that they may be qualified to warn others of the inevitable consequences of a determined perseverance in their evil courses. Such was that greatest of all former catastrophes—the deluge, of which Noah was warned one hundred and twenty years before it took place, that he might prepare an ark of safety for himself and admonish others that, by repenting of their sins, they also might escape the impending destruction; and, again, when only seven days remained of the appointed time, God spake to him for the last time; and as soon as he, the righteous one, had been preternaturally delivered, an overwhelming judgment, brought about by the immediate hand of God, swept away all unbelievers.

The history of the deluge is recorded for our use, and that not only as being a most signal proof of God's superintendence of human affairs, and of his altering the course of providence when provoked to interpose for the punishment of the sins of mankind, but also as being a type of another and a final judgment which shall overtake an ungodly world at the coming of the Lord. It is so used by Christ himself in the memorable discourse recorded in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew; and it is taken up by St. Peter in his epistles, who prophetically declares also the line of argument which the scoffers of the last

days would employ to excuse their unbelief. They will look around upon nature, and perceiving the seasons keeping their regular courses, and thinking that they can account for the order observable in all things by laws of matter which man is capable of understanding and the results of which science can predicate—because it can calculate their amount—proud of their science, men will say, we cannot believe that anything has interfered with, or shall hereafter disturb, this beautiful order of nature and this connection between cause and effect. They shall say, "Where is the promise of his coming? For, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the foundation of the world" (2 Pet. iii. 4).

It is to be remarked that they are not only disbelieving the promise of the coming of the Lord, but are grounding their unbelief of it upon disbelief of the deluge—implying that if they had given credence to this former act of judgment; brought about in a supernatural way by the immediate hand of God, they would be constrained in consistency to believe that he will inflict a similar judgment on the world which now is when it shall have consummated a similar act of wickedness, in rejecting the proffered mercy and despising the warning: for the former act was a type of that which is yet to come; but it is of the nature of all types that they do not in all respects correspond with the thing they are meant to foreshadow, and thus a judgment by water was the type of the future judgment by fire—the ark and those saved in it was a type of the salvation of those in the Church, &c. We have, therefore, no right to expect that the warning of one hundred and twenty years, or any direct warning from God, should precede the coming judgment; for though such interpositions were in analogy with all God's dealings at that time, the analogy of God's dealings with the Church, and during the present age of the world, forbid any such expectations. The grand distinction of the Church is the presence of the Holy Spirit, whom Christ promised to send after his ascension, and the peculiar office of the Comforter is to lead into all truth and to show us things to come; and it is by discerning the signs of the times, being enlightened thereto by the Holy Spirit, that the Church shall discern the approaching day of the Lord, and be also prepared to meet him; but this privilege belongs only to those who are, like Noah, walking in the obedience of faith: for, as the prophet Daniel says, "Many shall be purified and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand" (xii. 10).

Yet there are certain numbers given, both in the prophecies

of Daniel and in the book of Revelation, which have a bearing upon the several great epochs in the history of the Church and her trials preparatory to the great and final crisis. It is generally agreed, however, that all these preliminary epochs are passed and that all these numbers have now run out, and that we stand on the eve of the last catastrophe and of the day of the Lord, having nothing to look to but the signs of the times, which are now thickening upon us with unexampled rapidity, and in astonishingly accurate agreement with the character given of the last days in the Old Testament as well as in the New.

It will be apparent from the above that it is to *the facts* of the creation and of the deluge, and not to *the time* when those events took place, that we attach importance; because the facts are typical, and bear upon our own times and upon the history of the Church; but the chronology of the diluvian and antediluvian periods are of secondary and subordinate importance. Nor is the inspiration of Scripture in any degree involved in the determination of the year in which the creation or the deluge took place: for it is nowhere asserted how many years prior to the call of Abraham either of these events occurred, but only that the deluge began when Noah was six hundred years old, the time of which we have to calculate by summing up the years of the antediluvian patriarchs; as we have to sum up the ages of the post-diluvians to calculate the time which intervened between the days of Noah and those of Abraham. No point of doctrine, therefore, is involved in these calculations; nor are they interesting to us in any other way than as keeping up the thread of the narrative, and so giving consistency to the sacred history.

But it is remarkable that, whether from the carelessness of transcribers or from intentional meddling with the text, great differences occur among the existing manuscripts in the ages ascribed to several of the patriarchs, and by the insertion of a second Cainan between Arphaxad and Salah in the Septuagint version; or the omission of this Cainan in the Hebrew copies of the Scripture. The Septuagint version was prepared about three hundred years before Christ, and the Seder Olam of the modern Jews about eight hundred years after Christ and these two afford the greatest extremes of computation: for the Septuagint numbers would make the creation to have taken place 1580 years before the time which is assigned for it by Usher, while the reckoning of the modern Jews would make it 244 years later than Usher's time, making a difference of 1824 years between the two computations; but as it is certain that none of the existing manuscripts, either Hebrew or Greek, are so old as

to have been written in the pure primitive ages of the Church—and many of them betray marks of the greatest ignorance or carelessness—so we cannot be sure that we at present possess an accurate transcript of these older versions as to such minute particulars. It is otherwise with respect to doctrine: for this has been guarded by the greater watchfulness of the Church.

Our author contends for the superior accuracy of the Septuagint numbers, and especially for the insertion of the second Cainan, on the ground of his being retained in St. Luke's genealogy: and we have no difficulty in conceding these points, because we think them of little importance, though for our own part we are quite satisfied with the chronology of Usher. It is of little importance to us, as not involving any point of doctrine; and, as from the modern date of all manuscripts we are no more certain of having in them the *ipsissima verba* of St. Luke than those of Moses, it is as easy and as gratuitous to assert error in the one case as in the other: and as the transcribers of St. Luke certainly had recourse to the Septuagint and not to the Hebrew, so would their copies follow the Septuagint, in all probability, even although St. Luke had followed the Hebrew in his genealogy.

Nor is it yet determined what was the original reading in the Septuagint, for the numbers in different manuscripts differ almost as frequently from each other as they do from the Hebrew. The Clementine numbers are the highest of all, for they would place the Creation 5584 years before Christ: the Vatican manuscript will make 5408; the Alexandrian, 5439 years; and it is not easy to decide which of these has the best claim to authenticity: and it should be observed, that (except in the case of the second Cainan, where a whole generation is gained) nothing is really gained in point of population by the lengthened computations of the Septuagint; for the addition of one hundred years to the life of a patriarch *before* the time when he had children, which is the way in which the longer computation is brought in, warrants the conclusion that none had children till a more advanced age than the Hebrew numbers imply; and so the rate of increase throughout the world would be retarded in the very same proportion as the birth of the patriarch's first-born was retarded; and thus the supposed results of allowing more time for the natural increase of mankind is (except as to Cainan) nugatory and imaginary.

But it is necessary to be upon our guard against attaching any great importance to calculations based upon the rate at which population is at present found to increase; and applying this our present experience to a time when the years of man

were reckoned by centuries, and not as at the present by scores, and when the means of subsistence and all other circumstances were widely different: we, on the other hand, might with greater plausibility take the facts recorded in Scripture, and from them deduce an increase of population so rapid as to more than satisfy the requirements of the shortest chronological computation that has ever been brought forward.

Let us take the instance of the children of Israel in Egypt, who, when they entered the land, were seventy souls; and, after remaining two hundred and fifteen years, had become six hundred thousand men, besides women and children. Now, taking the chronology of Usher for our dates, the seventy who went down into Egypt had sprung from one individual in little more than fifty years; for Jacob fled alone from his father's house 1760 years before Christ, and the children of Israel went down into Egypt B.C. 1706; but it is within the range of possibility that the children of Israel might have gone on increasing in the land of Egypt, where they were well provided for, at the same rate as the family of Jacob increased while he was serving Laban in Mesopotamia or wandering as a stranger and pilgrim in the land of Canaan. If this be granted, these seventy souls might in fifty years become 4,900; in fifty years more they might become 343,000; and, in another fifty years, more than 24,000,000—a multitude far greater than is required, although we have computed the increase only for one hundred and fifty years, and the time of their sojourning was sixty-five years more than this.

And the increase of food for the subsistence of man is incalculable and beyond the conception of those who have not made the experiment: in fact, it knows no limits, save that of space sufficient to allow the plants to grow. Mr. Jackson, of Winslord, near Chester, gives an instance of one grain of wheat which, by parting, occupied twenty-seven square feet of ground, and produced 458 ears and 12,834 grains. Calculating the increase at the same rate, he found that, in the fourth year, the produce of this single gain would need more than forty times as much land as England contains to plant it; and, in the fifth year, one hundred and thirty-one times as much as the whole surface of the earth, supposing it all to consist of arable land. Mr. Henry Pownall, in the *Times* newspaper, September 9, 1843, records a still greater rate of increase which came to his knowledge in the grounds of Mr. A. Palmer, at Cheam, in Surrey. One grain of wheat, sown in July, 1842, was repeatedly parted, and in August, 1843, yielded 1,972 ears, with an average of fifty grains in the ear, or an increase of 98,600: and an-

other still more astonishing increase was printed in the *Times* of September 28, 1843, as having taken place in 1766, in the Botanical Garden at Cambridge. There Mr. Charles Miller, from one grain of red wheat, sown in June, obtained five hundred plants the following April, which, when harvested, yielded 21,109 ears, giving nearly four pecks of clear grain, weighing 47lbs. 7oz., and containing no less than 576,840 grains; we may, therefore, safely assert that there are no limits to the productive powers of wheat.

We do not, however, acknowledge the force of any of the Malthusian objections which may be raised to the shorter chronology deduced by Usher from the present Hebrew text; and we do not think that the charge made against the Jews of having wilfully falsified the text has been proved, however confidently it may have been asserted. The motive for such alterations as these is not made to appear; and the ends which they are supposed to seek would have been much more effectually attained by altering other passages of Scripture which, notwithstanding, remain in full and complete opposition to the Jewish errors and prejudices. We apprehend that there has been, during some periods of time, as much error and prejudice among Christians against the Jews as among the Jews against Christians; and certainly for some centuries, under the oppression of Mahommedanism in the East and of Popery in the West, the critical knowledge of Hebrew and Greek disappeared from the Church, and valuable manuscripts, even of the Scriptures, were expunged, that the parchment might be used to transcribe some absurd legend. When the Scriptures were so little understood, there would seem to be little temptation lying in the way of the Jews to commit the gratuitous crime of falsifying the text, and we do not believe that there are any errors in Scripture which can be ascribed with justice to a wilful opposition of the truth; but there is abundant reason for charging those ages with errors arising from ignorance, though these ages were the times when the oldest of the existing manuscripts were written, and though the mistakes are more numerous and more gross in the Greek manuscripts than in the Hebrew. We think that the Masoretes have been greatly maligned; whereas, for the pains which they took in endeavouring to preserve every letter of the Hebrew text, we respect and honour them. Their labours in counting the letters, and noting all such as were irregularly written, evince scrupulous accuracy and a conscientious desire to preserve the text precisely as they found it. Not only are some of these irregularities in the letters palpable mistakes —of putting one letter inadvertently in the place of another,

and thus forming a word which has no existence in the language —but whole sentences also are sometimes palpably misplaced, as in some of the alphabetic psalms, where a verse has got removed from the true place which its commencing letter so clearly demonstrates it must have originally occupied. In these cases of obvious blunders, in the former copyists, it would have been easy, and in one sense commendable, quietly to correct the mistakes and transmit the text as perfect as they could, but the conscientious scruples of the Masoretes would not allow them to do this; and we cannot bring ourselves to believe that the same men who, by their reverence for the word of God, were restrained from altering the jots and tittles thereof, would be at the same time so irreverent as to make such changes as are imputed to them and which would pervert the entire meaning of Scripture.

But it is objected that, as there is an acknowledged discrepancy between the Hebrew and the Septuagint in many respects, and especially in chronology, is it not more likely that the Septuagint (the version commonly used by the early Church) should be more correct than the Hebrew, which was in little use among Christians after the first and second centuries? It may be so in points affecting Christianity, but it does not seem to apply in this question of chronology: and our chief objection to the numbers in the Septuagint is, not that they differ from the Hebrew, but that the several codices differ from each other, and that it is not possible to determine which among them should be regarded as the authentic codex. Moreover, as we mentioned in our last number, a paper was presented by Mr. Cullimore to the Royal Society of Literature, some years ago, endeavouring to account for these many chronological divergencies, by showing that the precession of the equinoxes had at some periods been regarded as going on faster than the true rate, and at other times been estimated as proceeding slower than the truth; and that, since he was able to account for the differences by this one principle of a known *mistake* in the rate of precession—of a greater supposed amount when the copies containing the longest reckonings were made, and exactly tallying with the respective ages of them all in its quantity—he thought himself warranted in concluding that the several texts had been altered in conformity with this astronomical principle, which is known to have been prevalent at those several periods and is now *known to have been erroneous.* Mr. Cullimore, therefore, regarded the Hebrew text as the only one upon which he could place full reliance, because it was the only one which was free from marks of having been tampered

with—all the other texts having evidently suffered in a greater or less degree. In anything that we have written it has not been our intention to disparage the venerable version of the Septuagint: we only desire to guard against any unjust disparagement of the Hebrew text. We can concede the fact that errors attributable to the carelessness of copyists occur in the Hebrew, as in all other books committed to the care of man; but we do not allow that there has been wilful perversion of the meaning which would sap the foundations of our faith. There cannot be a question that the Septuagint supplies, in many instances, sentences which are not found in the present Hebrew text, and which we may regard as having been omitted from the Hebrew by the negligence of transcribers: such as Deut. xxxii. 43, which is referred to in Heb. i. 6; or the three verses in Psalm xiv. which come in between verses 3 and 4, being cited in that sequence by the apostle Paul, Rom. iii. 11-18. But, taking the Old Testament as a whole, the Hebrew must be regarded as the standard of our faith, and as infinitely superior to the Septuagint or any other version: these, at best, are but the productions of men; but the Hebrew is the word of God, and by it alone can we be safely guided—on it alone can we confidently rely.

The comparative merits of the Hebrew and the Septuagint may be in some degree appreciated by an English reader in the Psalms as found in our Bibles, which were translated from the Hebrew, and the Psalter of our Prayer-books, which was translated from the Septuagint. It will be seen, on comparison, how slight are the differences; yet that the Bible translation makes a far deeper impression and is, as a whole, immeasurably superior. But, to estimate aright the importance of the original, a man must be himself acquainted with the Hebrew, and must know some of the great truths which are not obvious in a mere dry translation however exact—being brought into manifestation by a careful consideration of the expressions in the original. One of the earliest of these instances occurs in the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, noticed by Mr. Smith in his fourth chapter (238-246). The Lord is represented as expostulating with Cain, saying—"If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door: and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him" (Gen. iv. 3). This is a literal translation of the Hebrew; but it is not very intelligible, especially in the last clause, "his desire," and over whom Cain should have the rule. Mr. Smith, following Lightfoot and other Hebrew scholars, contends that "sin" should be translated

"sin offering;" and then the passage would run—"a sin offering now lieth at the door, and to thee it shall be in submission, and thou mayest have the mastery over it." And thus a text, that has no very definite meaning as it stands, is made to throw a flood of light on primitive sacrifice.

"Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well—that is, if thou canst certainly approach God as a sinless and innocent man—thou mayest, as such, come with a thank offering; and shalt thou not be accepted? Thou certainly shalt, and experience the divine favour. But, if this is not thy character—if thou art not an innocent but a guilty man—not one who has done well but a sinner: if thou doest not well, then this manner of approach is not suitable to thy condition nor acceptable to God. He hath appointed another mode for sinners to come into his presence, founded on the principle that, without shedding of blood, is no remission of sin: and, therefore, if this is thy character, a sin offering lieth couching at the door: unto thee is its desire, and thou mayest rule over it: there is no difficulty: thou canst come, as thy brother did, with an offering of blood, and thou also shalt find acceptance. Thus, a clear and consistent sense is given to the entire passage: it is freed from tautology and ambiguity: and the text is worthy of the speaker."

Not less important, as an inducement to the study of Hebrew, is the consideration that it is certainly the most ancient of all known languages, and was, in all probability, the primitive language with which man was endowed at creation by the Creator. Mr. Smith properly scouts the absurd idea of supposing man to have been created speechless and to have taught himself to speak, gradually improving mere animal sounds till, in process of time, they were elaborated into a language. God SAID, Let us make man in our image: *speech* is the most essential part of that image, because it is the chief endowment which man holds in common with God. Speech makes the difference between man and inferior creatures: it is the medium of communication between God and man and between man and his fellows: by it we ask and receive of God, and both render praise to him and impart the knowledge of his ways to others. And, as if to confer the highest dignity upon speech, the Son himself, as mediator between God and man, takes to himself the name of the Incarnate WORD. The acts immediately done by man, such as naming the creatures, show that he was from the first endowed with speech; and the significance of the names which is retained in the Hebrew words for Eve, Cain, Abel, Seth, &c.—a significance which is lost in all translations—is a strong argument in favour of the idea that Hebrew was the original language. Among the antedilu-

vians, Mahalaleel was the contemporary of both Adam and Noah; while Shem, the son of Noah, was contemporary with Eber, the father of Peleg: so that, in this respect, Noah might be regarded as the grandson of Adam, and Eber as the grandson of Noah: and there can be no difficulty in admitting that the primitive language, whatever it was, would be preserved unimpaired to the time of Eber, since the stages are so few, although the time was long. But Hebrew was the language of Eber, and so called after him, and as spoken by those of his time. And thus the converse of the same argument may be applied in proof that the original language was Hebrew; for, being the language of Eber, it was also that of Shem, and Noah, and Mahalaleel, and Adam, and the gift of God.

Peleg, Eber's son, was so named because the earth was then divided among the families of mankind, Peleg, in Hebrew, signifying "division;" and Eber, in thus naming his son, gave a token of his assenting to that division of the earth which we know to have been God's purpose, both from the command given to Noah to replenish the earth and from the punishment inflicted on those who thought of counteracting that purpose in founding a metropolis and building the tower of Babel in the plains of Shinar: for Mr. Smith justly argues that, although it is not expressly declared that Noah was divinely commissioned to divide the earth among his descendants, yet it may be inferred from indirect intimations in Scripture, corroborated by ancient traditions and rendered probable by the very nature of the circumstances in which mankind then stood. It is implied (Deut. xxxii. 8) that God himself divided to the nations their inheritance; and, in doing so, reserved the land of Canaan for the children of Israel; but to whom could the commission be given with such propriety as to the head of the new world, and the heir of the righteousness which is by faith?—(Heb. xi. 7)—"The division of the earth among the several tribes had, therefore, begun when Peleg was born; and his father, on account of this memorable event, gave him a corresponding name," 380:—

"If, then, the divine purpose of a regular division of the earth among the several families of mankind was the subject of a special revelation from God to man, it seems most reasonable to suppose that it was communicated to Noah, and by him to his children, who were instructed to carry it into effect when their numbers had sufficiently increased to enable them to take possession of their allotted territories," p. 383.

This view, as Hales observes (i. 351), is supported by the

traditions among many of the heathen nations as to the first founding of their states, which they ascribe to some one who stood in a position towards mankind very similar to that of Noah, distributing kingdoms among his posterity, they acknowledging that he had the right to dispose of them in that manner. Mr. Smith supposes that sixty-four years elapsed between the birth of Peleg and the building of the tower of Babel; and that, as the division of the earth was virtually made at the time of Peleg's birth—for he was so named because "in his days the earth was divided"—so certain steps towards giving effect to this division would be taken by some of the posterity of Noah in the sixty-four years that ensued after this announcement of the divine purpose by the common father of mankind. And we may confidently assume that Eber was among the number of those that acquiesced in this appointment, and settled his family accordingly in Ur of the Chaldees; the naming of his son Peleg being an evidence of his faith and of his obedience to the divine appointment. And it is unequivocally implied in the account which we have in Scripture of the building of Babel, which was undertaken, said they, "lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth:" it is implied also in the act being regarded as an act of rebellion against the divine appointment and being punished as such—"Behold, they are all one, and have but one language, and this they begin to do. Shall they not be restrained in all they have imagined to do? Yes: we will go down and confound their language, that they may not understand one another" (p. 400). But then it follows that, as Eber named his son Peleg sixty-four years before the speech of mankind was confounded, he so named him in the one primitive language which up to that time had been the common and only dialect of all the descendants of Adam; and that, as there is no ground for supposing that Eber partook of the sin of those who projected the tower of Babel, or even journeyed in their company to the plains of Shinar, so there is no ground for supposing that the speech of Eber and his descendants was confounded when that judgment fell upon the rest of mankind.

The line of the faithful is carefully traced in Scripture through Shem, Eber, and Peleg, to the faithful Abraham. Among the builders of Babel, Nimrod had the lead, who was of the posterity of Ham: had Eber been present at the time, the place of supremacy would certainly have been conceded to him and to none other; but his name does not appear at all amongst them, and we have no doubt that it was because he had taken possession of the portion which was alloted by

Noah to the descendants of Shem, although, in process of time, the descendants of Ham encroached upon the southern portions of that inheritance of Shem in taking possession of the land of Canaan.

But if this be so, and if the original language of mankind was retained in the line of Eber and transmitted to his posterity, the Hebrews, that language not only presents in itself one of the most interesting objects for investigation, but it furnishes also a standard of comparison by which we can determine the nature and the extent of the confusion in other tongues, having one language preserved to us unconfounded. It is in every point of view a most interesting enquiry, which would lead us too much away from Mr. Smith's book to pursue on the present occasion, even if we had space in a review to follow it out. And it would need but a little modification of the system to which Mr. Smith adheres, and which is derived principally from the writings of Sir William Jones, in which all the principal languages of mankind are referred to one or other of three sources—the Sanscrit—the Arabic—and the Sclavonic or Tartarian—or the older and more generally adopted systems which trace the sources to Shem, Ham, and Japhet. We are quite satisfied, however, that some parts of Sir William Jones's system are quite untenable; and that, were he living now, he himself would feel the necessity of abandoning many points which seemed at that time to be tenable. He lived at a time when the Sanscrit was only beginning to be known, and when its antiquity and its importance were greatly overrated. Subsequent investigations have considerably lowered these lofty pretensions which were at first put forth, and have rendered it probable that it is rather the Sanscrit that has borrowed from the Greek than the Greek from the Sanscrit; and that Hebrew is still more ancient than any other language. Sir William Jones founded his system principally on *similarity of sounds*, which we believe to be a delusive criterion, especially when an European ear is attempting to estimate the differences in the sounds of Asiatic languages. And when the result has been arriving at the conclusion that the Greek, the Latin, the Gothic, and the Celtic have been derived from the Sanscrit—when it is manifest that no Greek, or Latin, or Gothic tongue can, at the present day, pronounce correctly a single word of Sanscrit—we hesitate in allowing that they ever could, and think that this diversity in the organs of speech presents an insuperable objection to the supposition that *the speech* of the one has been derived from that of the other. On the contrary, however, we agree with those who ascribe an

Asiatic origin to the Celtic speech, and who distinguish it on that very account both from the Teutonic and the Greek: all of which, together with the Persian, Armenian, and old Egyptian or Ethiopic, Sir Willam derives from the Sanscrit—languages which are as unlike each other as it is possible to be; but from all of which the Sanscrit has borrowed some words.

The dispersion was occasioned by a confusion of *tongue:* it was not caused by taking away the *reason* of men, so as to make them forget the former names of things—to call for one thing when they meant another. But it was caused by giving to their organs of speech those differences which we at present find among the different families of mankind; and which, among the lower orders, produce a contempt for those who speak differently from themselves, and render a friendly intercourse on equal terms almost impossible. We attribute a great deal of the hostility which the Irish express towards the English to this cause. They are a Celtic race and of Asiatic origin; and it is evinced in the aspirates and deep gutturals of their language, as well as in their wild imagination and in their unsettled, thoughtless, and reckless habits of life. The English feel not the same hostility towards them, only because they know that the cause of it lies, not in us, but in the Irish themselves. The remedy consists in the Irish laying aside their feuds with each other, and their imaginary feuds with the Saxon, which are all relics of barbarous ages and tend only to render that barbarism perpetual; and so prevent their becoming really what the Saxon, and Scottish, and Welsh clans have, in fact, now become—one brotherhood of Englishmen. We deny the existence of Saxons in England: it is a mere fiction of men who are still greater enemies of Ireland than of England; for, in keeping up the delusion, they are fomenting an animosity in the minds of the Irish, which, as long as it lasts, cannot but perpetuate the degradation and wretchedness of Ireland.

We believe that this confusion of speech was for the separation of one family from another family, and not for the separation of individuals from each other: and that, consequently, its effect was to divide mankind into seventy families, the heads of which are enumerated in the tenth chapter of Genesis, as being dispersed abroad to found the several nations of antiquity; but the means whereby that dispersion was accomplished follows in the eleventh chapter, and it confirms the inference we drew from Peleg's name, and renders the fact certain that his line did not partake in the sin which occasioned the confusion of tongue, and that he and his line were exempt from that judg-

ment, to find that the family of Peleg is not included among the seventy which are enumerated as the families which were scattered abroad; but his posterity, being omitted from the list of those who resisted the purpose of God, is separately recorded as the faithful branch of the line of Shem, and as dwelling in Ur of the Chaldees, and spreading southwards, through Haran, towards the land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 16-32).

We can form some idea of the *nature* of this confusion of speech, but can form no correct estimate of its *amount* at the time, and still less of the changes which have been wrought, by these means, in the various dialects of mankind during the long course of intervening ages, and in the extinction of old languages and the introduction of new. We have not a single fragment remaining of these seventy dialects, and we know not the correct sounds of the Hebrew language itself, for it has long been a dead language; and, granting that the Jews retained the correct pronunciation till the time of the captivity, we know from the book of Nehemiah that their speech became corrupt during their stay in Babylon; and at the present day the Jews in their dispersion acquire something of the dialects of the countries in which they are scattered, and especially of the land wherein they have been born and educated from childhood; and they thus read Hebrew more according to the pronunciation of the place where they happen to sojourn than according to any uniform standard.

But it is only concerning the *pronunciation* of Hebrew that we are thus in the dark; for the language itself is preserved unimpaired in *its written character*, which we believe to have subsisted in its present form—that is, in the square character—from the time of Moses, and not to have been changed by Ezra at the return of the Jews from Babylon. The supposition that Ezra changed the writing from the Samaritan form of letters into the square, which is commonly called the Chaldee form, has arisen from two mistakes—a mistake of the meaning in Nehemiah and a mistake in the age of Hebrew sheckels. We are told that the Jews who returned from Babylon had, during the captivity, lost not only the knowledge of the law, but even purity of speech, and that they spake a corrupt and Babylonish dialect. Ezra set about reforming this by teaching them the law in its integrity; which could, of course, only be done by keeping the word in which the commandments and ordinances of the law were given in its pristine purity, and by lifting them out of that corruption and degradation, both of doctrine and of dialect, into which that whole generation had fallen during the seventy years of captivity in

Babylon. Accordingly, Ezra gathered all those who had any remnant of knowledge of the law or of the language of Moses to begin by instructing them, "both of men and women, and *all that could hear with understanding;*" and he read in "the book of the law of Moses"....."from the morning until mid-day" (Neh. viii. 1, 2, 3). And, because the people had been so long unaccustomed to hear the pure Hebrew, he read the book distinctly—that is, sentence by sentence—and the Levites gave the sense, and caused the people "*to understand the reading*" (verse 8); but further on in the history (xiii. 24), we find that some of the Jews had taken wives of strangers, and the children of these mixed marriages "spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and *could not speak in the Jew's language*, but according to the language of each people." Against this defilement Nehemiah contended, seconding the endeavours of Ezra to bring back the people, both in word and deed, to the law of Moses, from which in all respects they had so widely departed; but the preservation of the very letter of the book of the law, down to the correct form of its characters, was essential to this; and there is not a hint in Scripture that it was otherwise.

On the other hand, it is certain that an opinion generally prevails, supported by most respectable authority, that Ezra changed the whole book, not only of the law, but of the prophets and psalms, adopting, in place of the character which was in use before the captivity, a new character which he found in use among the Chaldeans, and the knowledge of which had been acquired by the Jews while in captivity at Babylon. A comparison of the two characters is sufficient to convince us of the contrary, since the square letters are beyond question the more perfect of the two, and it is conceded that everything was corrupted in Babylon. Moreover, in examining the antiquities of Babylon, we have never been able to find a trace or vestige of anything at all resembling Hebrew letters among its ancient inhabitants; but only the well-known arrow-headed characters, which bear no resemblance whatever to the Hebrew alphabet, either of the square or of the Samaritan form: yet our own convictions will not sway others, and an opinion so respectably supported as the above is entitled to consideration, that we may endeavour to find the way in which a mistake which has been so long entertained at first crept in.

We regard the mistake as having begun at the time when the Masoretic school at Babylon obtained its celebrity, and during the composition of the Babylonian Gemara, and the Chaldee paraphrase; and when the Hebrew was ceasing to be a living language, being superseded by the Syriac or the Greek. And

it has rested principally on the assertion of Jerome who is really no authority on such a subject, and who has told us that his knowledge of Hebrew was acquired from the instructions of four Jews at different times, and who probably heard the story from one or other of his Jewish teachers. In more recent times Brian Walton is the first authority, and all his followers have taken the same line of argument, which rests principally upon the fact that sheckels have been found, bearing Samaritan characters, of far greater antiquity than any which bear the square characters. This is true; but it is now proved that all the sheckels which have square characters are modern counterfeits, and that none of the other sheckels are older than the time of the Maccabees, and therefore become an argument against instead of one in favour of the opinion.

The science of numismatics has made very great advances in our age, and in nothing has its value been more remarkably shown than in the light which has been cast thereby upon history, by rejecting spurious coins and by connecting such as are genuine with those events or personages to which they really appertain. The best numismatists are unanimous in asserting that there was no coined money in use among the Jews before they were led into captivity—far less before the separation of the ten tribes—and on the supposed existence of which the argument for the ancient use of the Samaritan letters wholly rests; and they are as unanimous in asserting that the most ancient sheckels in existence are of the age of the Maccabees—a fact proved by their all being of one style of execution, and many of them bearing the initials of Simon and the year in which they were struck: so that these prove that the Samaritan letters were those that were in use among the Jews after their return from the captivity in Babylon; and the contemporaneous existence of the two forms of letters—the square being restricted to the Bible and its commentaries—that is, restricted to sacred purposes—and the other, or Samaritan letters, being used on the coins and for all secular purposes—is only in analogy with the present practice of the Jews, who restrict the pure Hebrew to the Scripture, and use the Rabbinical letters for all ordinary occasions: and, as we know that the same distinction into sacred and profane characters prevailed in the Syriac, and Cufic, and Amharic alphabets, and is found in the sacred and demotic forms of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, it is probable that it may have been observed from a very early period among the Israelites; and thus, as the ten tribes had no priests among them when they separated from Judah, they could only carry with them that form of letters which they used

for secular purposes, and copied the Pentateuch into that which was the only form they themselves understood.

We, therefore, regard the supposition of a change in the Hebrew letters, not merely as improbable and destitute of proof, but regard all the arguments that have been adduced as tending to an opposite conclusion, and as fortifying the position which we were induced to take by the internal evidence of the language itself—namely, that Hebrew is the primitive language, and that the square letters constitute the primitive characters in which the Hebrew language was originally written; and we not only agree with those who maintain that man did not teach himself to speak, being endowed with the faculty of speech at creation, but we also agree with those who hold that alphabetic writing was not of human invention, but came by revelation from God. The giving of the law from Mount Sinai—the tables being expressly declared to be written with the finger of God—teaches us that writing was an endowment not unworthy of the divine interposition; though we think it probable that the first communication of the art of writing to man long preceded the time of Moses, and may even have been made to the antediluvians, for its origin is lost in its unfathomable antiquity.

But this much we are assured of, that, setting aside all speculation and making the known alphabets of mankind the basis of our investigations, there is not one among them which cannot be traced back historically to the Hebrew, or to a people who had themselves acquired their knowledge of letters from the Hebrew. There is no known instance of any nation having invented letters for themselves: there is not even an instance of the conversion of hieroglyphics into letters. The Chinese to the present day use their old hieroglyphics written in a more compendious form; and the Egyptians did little more than the Chinese have done, save that they restricted themselves to a few of those hieroglyphical forms which had before been unlimited and innumerable. It was by becoming acquainted with the advantages of alphabetic writing that the Egyptians reduced their cumbrous system to that limited number and more compendious form of hieroglyphics which we find in the papyri; but it is still merely hieroglyphical, and just because it is so it has opened up to us the contents of the hieroglyphical inscriptions; and because all are hieroglyphical, and not alphabetic, they have by their meagreness disappointed, and will continue to disappoint, the expectations of the public.

If it was worthy of God to give a revelation of his will at all, then it is also worthy of God that he should give to man the means by which that revelation might be transmitted unim-

paired from generation to generation. The word spoken dies away in the utterance—the memory of that word and the power to make it known to others perishes with the individuals to whom it was first spoken; but, in the wonderful art of writing, the transient breath of man is seized hold of and stamped with the features of eternity. "All flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth for ever; and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."

When we examine the earliest of the heathen fragments—such as those attributed to Hermes, Sanchoniatho, and Berosus—we find indisputable evidence of their Hebrew derivation and origin. This appears not only in the general tenor and particular facts of these traditions, and in the absurdities and contradictions of the heathen cosmogonies becoming capable of reconciliation with each other by the help of the scriptural record—it appears also in the introduction of Hebrew names, which conveyed no meaning in Greek, but much in the original Hebrew. The creative wind is called "Colpias" by Sanchoniatho, which is "Col Pi," the voice of the mouth or the creative word. The dark and formless void is called "Baau," or "Bohu," in the Hebrew. The sun is called "Beelsamin," or "Baal Shamaim," the Lord of the heavens. So also "Misor," ruler; "Sydic," just; "Ilus" and "Eloeim," God; "Elioun," the Eternal; and many similar names, which are sometimes interpreted, sometimes not so; and which make it manifest that the tradition had none other than a Hebrew origin, however much it may have been corrupted by the heathen.

Many of these traditions are noticed by Mr. Smith, and are turned to a good account in better establishing the truth. Indeed, he has told his readers, at the beginning of the volume, that it was the want experienced in his own case, at the commencement of his investigation of ancient history, that prompted the present undertaking. This is only the first volume of a work which it is expected may be completed in two other volumes of the same size, and thus carry down the chronology of the Bible to the commencement of the Christian era. It is a work, therefore, which has about it the satisfactory character of being really called for, and carries with it the impression of real substantial earnestness, in which there is no room for speculation. This earnest tone is sustained throughout from its being begun in faith, and with the determination to make the Scriptures, as the word of God, the standard and the test of truth; and, from the natural consequence of this faith, "that it has been throughout an integral part of the author's design

to impart to the work a decidedly religious character." His piety, however, has not cramped his investigations or narrowed his judgment; but, confident in the truth of Scripture, he has not hesitated to carry its torch into the dark labyrinths of the heathen, knowing that the divine light would not only suffice to guide him safely through, but might also enable him to bring back from those deep recesses some precious treasure as a votive offering to the shrine of faith, which, as it is one, so also has it been perennial, and must be indestructible: and we beg to assure the author that, if we have seemed to differ from him or to question some of his conclusions, the difference between us is more in appearance than in reality; and it has proceeded from the desire to do what in us lay, by suggesting matter for consideration which may be useful in the further prosecution of the work, not in order to cavil at that portion of it which is already before us.

In the further prosecution of the work, however, chronology will become more and more important; for the time of the Exode is of great consequence, both as the accomplishment of the four hundred and thirty years predicted to Abraham, and as fixing the age of Moses and the giving of the law. The time of the Judges is also attended with difficulty, as some of them seem to have ruled one portion of the land, while others judged in other districts *at the same time*. We expect to follow our author with pleasure in discussing these points in his future volumes.

And to our clerical readers especially we would cordially commend this volume as being a compendium of information on subjects which cannot but come before them frequently at the present day; and as containing extracts of nearly all that is valuable from works which are very voluminous, and, from their rarity, are not brought within the reach of many of our parochial clergy. The author himself has deeply felt the inconvenience of being situated at a distance from public libraries, where alone some of the requisite authorities are generally to be found; and, on the principle of doing to others as he would be done by, he has made his references as full as can be required; and they are given either in the very words of the writers or in approved translations. The table of contents is pretty full, but an index would have been a valuable addition to this volume. We take it for granted that there will be one of the whole work: for where so many authors are quoted, and such various topics are referred to, the readers require frequently to consult former passages in the work, which cannot easily be found without the assistance of an index.

ART. II.—*History of the Reformation in Germany.* By LEOPOLD RANKE. Translated by SARAH AUSTIN. Vol. III.

HAVING already laid before the readers of this *Review* (No. xliv.) a copious account of the former two volumes of this important work, we resume our labours with the third, which forms the second division of the whole scheme, as originally planned by its author. We do not think it necessary to make any apology for again resuming the same subject—the same in name, though widely different in contents—as in no single article could justice be done to five thick octavo volumes. It may also be recollected that we expressed a wish to make this *Review* a permanent depository of the more generally interesting portions of these volumes, for the benefit of those readers whose avocations or habits place such a work beyond their reach, but who may nevertheless be desirous of knowing the opinions of so profound, learned, and independent a thinker upon one of those events in history in which all mankind are, or will be, interested.

For many years the history of Germany was made up of the struggles between the spiritual and temporal powers, in which the latter ultimately succumbed to the former, which thus became a power of the first-rate order. Just when, however, an alliance of amity was formed between the papacy and the vanquished imperial power, the empire fell into confusion and anarchy at home and lost its respect abroad; till at length, seemingly helpless amidst endless disorders, the nation felt only that such a state of things must somehow pass away.

The history of the latter part of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century exhibits the conflicts of the German nation in its efforts to remedy these evils, by creating a power in the empire resting at once on the principles of the Emperor and those of the States. The radical changes which would naturally be proposed in such an attempt, as might be expected from the evil passions of our imperfect nature, threw Germany into universal confusion.

Hence, failing in the reform of secular abuses, the nation seized on the affairs of the Church and the functions of the papacy, which exercised so large a share of power in the empire. And now, Ranke observes:—

"The wonderful coincidence was, that just as (papal) abuses had risen to the most intolerable height, the study of the sacred books in their original tongues once more revealed to the world, in all its ra-

diance, that pure idea of Christianity which had so long been darkened or disguised. A man appeared who, in that secret travail and contention of mind to which the remedies usually applied by the Church afforded no relief, seized with his whole soul on an aspect of Christianity hitherto the most profoundly obscured; and such was his own experience of its truth, fulness, and saving power, that he would never more suffer it to be wrested from him, but maintained it unshaken through life and death. In the contest to which it gave rise he drew around him all the other elements of innovation, with a consistency and sagacity which at length gained the whole nation, and secured to himself a degree of sympathy such as no other man ever enjoyed. At the same time he gave a new direction to religious thoughts and feelings—he opened a new prospect of national regeneration. Men already felt that the papacy was not to be held in check by constitutional forms; and that, if they would free themselves from its usurpations, they must contest the spiritual grounds on which those usurpations rested."

The master-spirit thus brought before us is, of course, Luther. Indeed, we question if a deeper and truer insight into the characters of the two reformers of the age, Luther and Zwingle, has been obtained and presented to the world by any other well-known writer.

Charles V., who was elected amidst these troubles, remained faithful to the old system: but his continued absence from Germany made this of less importance; for the council of regency, after a brief hesitation, declared for Luther, though its measures for the constitution of a national Church entirely failed. Germany had been too long a stranger to order to yield obedience to the decrees of a national council. Hence the several States provided for their own wants. Providentially the emperor's attempts to re-establish his rights in Italy furthered the good cause; for, as he could do nothing in his disputes with the papacy without the aid of Germany, hence, for that aid, he must make concessions. A solemn decree of the diet (says Ranke) was passed, whereby an almost absolute religious independence was granted to the Princes and States within their several dominions—let us call this a designed coincidence—so that whilst a German army marched into Italy, conquered Rome, and made the Pope himself a prisoner, many of the territories and cities on this side the Alps adopted and put in practice the principles of Luther: they freed themselves for ever from the papacy and established an ecclesiastical organization of their own.

The fence of those hierarchies with which the world had been shut in being thus broken down, men sought their religious convictions from primitive sources, and freed civil society

from the intrusions of a power which seemed to have forgotten both its origin and its limited mission. Human nature must have been something then different from what it was before and has been since, if such mighty changes as these had not been accompanied by evils which might occasionally shake the faith of even friends, in their truth. But the *iræ amantium* were in this case far less dangerous than the hatred of an *injusta noverca*. The Church of Rome could not passively allow such innovations so long as she could command hands to draw the sword—to light the martyr's fire—to open, shut, and never open again the doors of the Inquisition, and to use the assassin's dagger.

It came to this, therefore, that the emperor and empire once more embraced the cause of the hierarchy, and from that moment is to be dated the commencement of the fiercest and most perilous struggles. And since (adds Ranke), at the conclusion of this brief retrospect, "We have watched the founding of the edifice, it now remains for us to see whether it will have sufficient strength and solidity to stand erect and unsupported."

Ranke begins the first chapter of this volume "with a view of the foreign relations of the empire, by which the general position of the emperor was determined, and which, consequently, exercised a powerful re-action in the affairs of Germany." He embraces the years 1527-1528, in the former of which Rome was plundered and the Pope taken prisoner, though he was soon released by the emperor's fears and selfish calculations.

Much of the interest of this and similar secular portions of the history will depend upon the value attached by its student to the discovery of that theocratic element which is the only true key to its puzzles, and which Ranke himself so often brings forward. We perceive that Charles had heartily embraced the cause of the hierarchy and of Rome; and, if his power had kept pace with his wishes, the Reformation must, humanly speaking, have been crushed; but the derangement of his vast possessions called off his attention to other matters. The Ligue lay still encamped before him in unbroken force, and our own King Henry VIII. began to show favour to its chiefs. As early as 30th April, a treaty was concluded between him and Francis I., in which both agreed to make war against the emperor, without delay, unless he set at liberty the French princes, and satisfied the pecuniary demands of England. By way of strengthening this friendship Cardinal Wolsey repaired to Amiens, and renounced, in the king's name, all the old claims of England to the throne of France upon the condition of the payment of a sum to King Henry and his successors, "without ceasing, until

all the years which Divine Providence has appointed to the human race shall have passed away."

Henry's divorce soon caused a fresh entanglement:—

"It is a well-known fact (says Ranke), and one to which we shall often have occasion to refer, that this divorce proved fatal to the influence of the papacy in England; but, if we ascend to that higher point of view which commands the general relations of Europe, we shall see that the schemes of Henry VIII. were, at this criticalmoment, productive of advantage to the papal power."

At all events, it served greatly to divert the emperor from interfering with the progress of reform in Germany.

In January, 1528, the emporor's attention was also powerfully diverted by Lautrec, who now entered the kingdom of Naples. With much difficulty the Prince of Orange led the German troops from the luxuries of Rome to Naples, to save it from falling into their hands. "God, however, sent amongst the French (says a German report) such a pestilence that out of twenty-five thousand not above four thousand survived." Lautrec was amongst the dead. This temporary relief to the emperor was, however, soon after counterbalanced by a corresponding result in upper Italy, where similar diseases, which had destroyed the French army before Naples, attacked the German troops, which, in the summer of 1528, had crossed the Alps under Henry of Brunswick and Marx Sittich of Ems, in aid of the emperor: thereupon a fresh French army made its appearance in Ivrea under St. Pol.

Nor was this all. The Turkish power now threatened the emperor through Hungary. Whilst Ferdinand was himself present in Hungary, order was in some measure maintained; but as soon as he absented himself, Zapolya, from his exile at Tarnow, succeeded in keeping it in a state of agitation. In the beginning of 1528, a treaty had been concluded between Suleiman and Zapolya, in which the latter had declared that he "would now and always serve the mighty Sultan with all the powers of his kingdom, of his hereditary possessions, and even of his own person."

On the other hand Suleiman agreed, "I will be a true friend, and ally, and support, against all enemies with all my power. I swear it by the prophet, by the prophet beloved of God, Mohammet, and by my sword." George Martinuzzi, a monk of the Pauline order and the devoted friend of Zapolya, wandered from castle to castle, revived old connections, and prepared everything for his lord's reception, the main thing being the promise of Suleiman's succours.

We can only just allude to the plot of the celebrated Dr. Pack, to which Ranke devotes nearly a whole chapter: indeed, its origin and its consequences, both threatened and real, teach lessons too important to be forgotten by the historian. In consequence of so many evangelical princes having thrown off the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts, numerous complaints were laid before the imperial court, and the expediency of resorting to punishments, and even to ban, was then suggested. A vague rumour of such designs found its way to Germany. The landgrave was warned of "extraordinary practices against the Lutherans;" but, though he was fully persuaded that a plot was in agitation against him, yet he believed it arose amongst his neighbours only.

Just at this time, Otto Von Pack, the steward of the chancery of Duke George, came to the landgrave upon some legal business, when the latter disclosed to him his apprehensions of certain dangers. "Pack sighed and was silent. This only increased the landgrave's urgency. Pack at length declared that a league against the Lutherans was, indeed, not only in hand, but actually concluded." He engaged to procure the *original* documents, upon the promise of protection and a reward of ten thouthousand gulden. Soon after he produced at Dresden a *copy* only of the original, regularly attested, and for it received four thousand gulden. This document contained the most alarming matter. It appeared that the electors of Mainz and Brandenburg, the Dukes of Saxony and others, "had bound themselves in the first place to fall upon the Elector of Saxony if he refused to deliver up Luther and his followers, and to partition his territory; and next to attack the landgrave, and, if he would not recant, to drive him out of his country."

The landgrave and the elector both believed this alarming document, and at Weimar entered into an agreement for defence and attack. Even Luther did not detect the forgery; but he checked their intention of striking the first blow by the reasonable proposal of laying before the accused party Pack's document, and demanding an explanation. Luther had no doubt of the justice of war in self-defence, but he could not comprehend how the Christian could strike the first blow. "War (he would so wisely teach) ventures all, wins little, and is certain to lose; but meekness loses nothing, risks little, and wins all."

Accordingly, the accused princes were charged with this plot; and says Ranke—"It is impossible to describe the astonishment that seized the German courts at the appearance of the accusation founded on this document. Duke George answered

immediately, and denounced the man who affirmed that he had seen the original as a false and perjured villain." Ranke then discusses the question—"which does not yet seem to be set at rest—what was the real truth concerning this alleged treaty?" And both from the grossest improbabilities stated in the document itself, as well as from the utterly disreputable character of Pack—a convicted scoundrel, in fact—he concludes that the document must be "entirely rejected." Ranke remarks in a note that he arrived at this conclusion, "without using any thing that Pack confessed on the rack."

But ere the forgery was discovered mischief had taken place, for an attack had been made upon the Würzberg territory. Melancthon so deeply mourned over this result as to write—"It almost consumes me, when I reflect with what stains our good cause is covered by it. I can only sustain myself by prayer." But the aggressor's regrets did not remedy the evil, which was followed by the gravest and most dangerous consequences; "for such an outrageous breach of the public peace threw an ill light on all the proceedings of the religious party."

Still further to shew how great a fire a little spark kindleth, and how little controul even the good and the wise have over the origin and direction of such a spark, Ranke adds:—

"Though there existed in the leaders of both parties a certain inclination to oppose the House of Austria, and to join the European confederacy against it, we find that affairs took a totally different direction; and that it was in fact a mistake, a fraud, and an act of rashness, which brought the conflicting passions into play."

But still the work of God went on, and, as a matter of course, the opposition of its enemies served but to further it. On the evangelical side, institutions in harmony with the new opinions began to be organized: on the other side, measures were resorted to, to keep up the tottering edifice of Catholicism. On the 20th of July, 1528, it was ordered by authority that "heretics should be punished, not as ordinary criminals, but as malefactors of the highest order." In Bavaria the streets were entered, and those who attended the preachings in the neighbourhood were seized and punished. The duke caused nine men to die by fire and twenty-nine by water. Leonhard Käsar came from Wittenbergh to Schärding to visit his dying father—he was betrayed, seized, and burned. John Hüylin, of Lindau, was committed to the flames as "an enemy of the holy mother Church." A preacher of Halle was cited to appear at Aschaffenburg, and was murdered on his way back—a crime which was openly attributed to the chapter at Mainz. In Cologne, Adolf

Clarenbach was condemned to death, "because he would not believe that the Pope was the head of the Church—because he seemed to doubt whether some things had not occasionally been established by councils contrary to the divine word, and the like." Such was the state of things in Germany.

Ranke then proceeds to direct attention to the religious movement in Switzerland—"one of the most important incidents in the general progress of the Reformation." Nor, as he has shown, can the history of Germany during the Reformation be fully understood and written without noticing it.

Although Germany and Switzerland were very differently circumstanced externally, yet both were now imbued with the same moral and intellectual spirit. The literary tendencies of the German schools of poetry found acceptance here; and here, too, arose an extensive literary public, of which Erasmus formed the active centre from the time he settled at Basle. Luther's earliest writings also excited deep interest in Switzerland. There were students at Wittenbergh who returned home to tell that they witnessed the deed of Luther's burning the Pope's bull, and their names are still preserved. The doctrine spread from the plain country and the cities to the mountains. Notwithstanding, however, such sympathies, the movement in Switzerland assumed a different character, even as to religious questions. The explanation lies in the difference between the characters of the two leaders, Luther and Zwingle. In the judgment of the other contemporary historian of the Reformation, Zwingle seems to be regarded as scarcely more than the *primus inter pares.** With submission, however, we side with Ranke, who considers that the peculiarities of the proceedings, and the issues in the two countries, "were mainly the result of the intellectual character and training of the man who commenced and carried through the conflict—Ulrich Zwingle."

Of this remarkable man we shall only select a few of those points which will enable us to exhibit Ranke's views of him, which, being less tinctured with partizanship, appear to us to be more in accordance with the nature of the case.

Zwingle was born on New-year's-day, 1484, a few weeks after Luther. "The most remarkable trait of this youth is his natural quick and clear sense of truth: he once mentioned that, when he first began to reflect on public affairs, the doubt occurred to him whether a lie ought not to be more severely punished than stealing; for veracity (said he) is the mother and

* D'Aubigne, Vol. II. p. 282, 1846.

source of every virtue." Such as would accurately judge of his future career must not lose sight of this divine gift of nature: it is almost sure of itself to set a man at war with the world. Moreover, the effect upon his mental character, of a prepared and most enthusiastic study of the ancients, must be appreciated. In the midst of these pursuits he took up Erasmus's edition of the Greek Testament—transcribed St. Paul's epistles with his own hand in fair writing—first wrote commentaries upon the margin from the fathers of the Church—then threw these aside that he might learn from God's pure and simple word his will; and at Einsiedeln, whither he had removed in 1516, "he plainly told Cardinal Schiner that *Popery had no foundation in Scripture.*" Such was the conviction of an accomplished scholar who knew Popery in all its bearings, and who thought to utter a lie about that, or any other thing, was worse than stealing.

Another characteristic feature, which created a natural difference between him and Luther, was that Zwingle was a republican, reared in the perpetual stir of a small commonwealth, and he more than once took the field with his warlike flock. We soon find him in a subordinate situation at Einsiedeln, which, however, "led him to a more complete and consistent development of his opinions." The examples and precepts of the ancients and the Scriptures, compared with the moral and political barrenness around him, raised in him a spirit of reformation which only needed a suitable sphere for its development: this he found at Zurich in 1519.

Here his preaching, "for which he had a singular natural gift," produced a great effect; but his efforts were mainly directed to rendering the meaning of Scripture plainer to his hearers. He studied simplicity that all might understand him; and, in "a wide circle of hearers, he laid the foundations of that faith which stood fast in the day of the tempest, and afforded him firm support in all his undertakings."

"In daily life he was of an easy, cheerful disposition, and had learned how to live with men, and how to deal with them, in the republic of a village, in the camp, and in the resort of strangers at Einsiedeln. He was not free from youthful vices—sometimes of an offensive kind; but his correspondence shows how earnest were his self-reproaches and his endeavours to amend. After a time his conduct became irreproachable. He laboured to subdue ebullitions of anger as well as those of other passions: he drove away fantastic humours by music; for he, too, was fond of music and a master of several instruments: he loved a retired and domestic life, and his favorite food was that of his country—various preparations of milk; but he never refused an invitation: he frequented the guild meetings

of the citizens, the holiday feasts of the peasants, and enlivened every company by his cheerful spirit and pleasant discourse. Laborious as he was, much as he undertook and accomplished, he repulsed no one: he had the art of saying something agreeable and satisfactory to everybody: he was well made and robust, charitable and good-humoured, cheerful, accessible, contented, and, at the same time, full of the greatest and noblest thoughts."

We have given at full length this graphic sketch of Zwingle as an admirable specimen of Ranke's masterly skill in painting character without the appearance of an effort. The student who wishes really to understand Zwingle's peculiar career would do well to realize in his imagination the man thus plainly bodied forth before him.

We must add one or two more of these views. It was not, Ranke thinks, the profound sense of the power of faith and of its connection with redemption, in which Luther's efforts originated, that made Zwingle a reformer: he became so chiefly because, in the course of his study of Scripture in search of truth, he found the Church and the received morality at variance with its spirit. While Luther's main object was a reform of doctrine, which he thought would be necessarily followed by that of life and morals, Zwingle aimed directly at the improvement of life and morals: he kept in view mainly the practical significancy of Scripture as a whole, and his original views were of a moral and political nature: hence his labours were tinged with wholly a peculiar colour.

The scene of his labours was at Zurich, and the issue of them was "the emancipation of Zurich from the episcopal government of Constance," and hence from the whole system of the Latin hierarchy.

We cannot yet dismiss the comparison between the two reformers. Whereas Luther wished to retain everything in the ecclesiastical institutions not at variance with the express words of Scripture, Zwingle would cut away everything not directly found in Scripture. Luther only desired to purify the Latin Church. Zwingle aimed at complete revolution—images, crosses, the most precious pictures, frescoes, organs, all disappeared before Zwingle. Luther would have purified and spared; but the grand difference lay on the interpretation of Scripture, in reference to "the most important of all spiritual acts." Zwingle came to the conclusion that the *is* of the institutional words of the Lord's supper signifies nothing more than "*denotes*." The reply of Luther, "who had an instinctive aversion to any departure from the simple, clear, and literal meaning of words, is a general one—that he holds fast to the infallible word; and that to God

nothing is impossible." Luther, however, contemplated the subject from a far higher region than that in which mere words are weighed: he reasoned upon the two natures in Christ. The difference between these good men and original thinkers teaches, however, humbling lessons. Indeed, we may almost conclude that, if the intellectual and spiritual constitution of Luther *compelled* him to adopt certain views, that of Zwingle rendered it impossible he should not reject them. Luther's views were many of them those of the *individual:* he was profoundly attached to the traditions of the Church; and, though he was expelled from it, he never denied its origin. "If we take a comprehensive view of the great historical movement of opinion and doctrine throughout the world, we shall see that Luther was the organ through which the Latin Church resumed a freer, less hierarchical form, and one more in harmony with the original tendency of Christianity." Zwingle was encumbered with none of these views—his republican mind was far more occupied with the idea of the Commune than of the Universal Church. Ranke thinks, however, that Zwingle "evinced an apt and acute sense for the original meaning and spirit of the Scriptures." This is high praise: the summing up is this:—

"Had Luther and his disciples stood alone, the principle of the Reformation would probably have rapidly acquired stability; but it would, perhaps, as rapidly have lost its living progressing power. It is difficult to imagine Zwingle standing alone; but, had views like his arisen without those of Luther, the chain of the historical development of the Church would have been violently broken. Thus, it was decreed by divine Providence—if we may presume to say so—that these two systems should make their way together. They co-existed each in its place—each the offspring of a sort of internal necessity: they belonged to each other—they completed each other: yet these two victims of the great party of reform, regardless of their common antagonist, attacked each other with furious zeal."

We shall not follow Ranke in his sketch of the struggles in Switzerland, our subject being Germany: but, as we said, Luther was, for a time at least, impeded in his work by the importation of Swiss opinions; for Rutzer and Capeto, two reformers of Strasburg, had taken part in the conference at Berne, and had long been zealous advocates for Zwingle's system. Lindau and Memmingen soon followed Strasburgh. Other preachers, as Somius, Cellarius, Blaurer, and Hermann, preached the same doctrine in many of the towns of Germany. Some even proposed forming indissoluble ties with the evangelical towns of the Swiss Confederation. "This antagonism (says Ranke) between the new opinions and the new-born in-

stitutions of eastern and western Germany was undoubtedly a great misfortune. The polemical writings of that period filled all minds with mutual antipathy." Nevertheless, Ranke concludes that reform in Switzerland originated in causes and in sentiments native and peculiar to the country; that it struck root in its own soil and assumed a form and growth of its own, which was unquestionably fortunate for the world at large, since it gave to the general principle of the Reformation fresh vigour and stability.

We can but very briefly notice the subject of the fourth chapter—"Political Character of the Year 1529"—though it is replete with the best part of history—its philosophy.

At this time a conflict of the German forces by land, and the Roman by sea, with those of the Ottoman, seemed imminent. Christendom, too, was torn with divisions. The Emperor had serious thoughts of stripping the Pope of his temporal possessions; whilst the Emperor's adversaries proposed to call in the aid of the Pope for deposing him. France, too, yet refused, notwithstanding all reverses, to renounce her possesions in Italy. To these political conflicts was added that of religious opinions, "less noisy at this moment, but pregnant with far more weighty consequences." Germany, however, was the battle-field; for that nation had to fight out the battle with the Ottomans on the Continent, to maintain its supremacy in Italy, and to bring the religious quarrels to a decision or a compromise. The wish of the German people, therefore, was that the emperor would place himself at the head of the resistance to the hierarchy; and, supported by all the energy of the nation, assert the rights of the empire of whatever kind, and drive back the barbarians beyond the Danube. This would seem to have been the true policy of the emperor; but, as Ranke observes, a man placed in the midst of the conflict of opposing powers and influences of such magnitude is seldom able to come to a perfectly free, deliberate, and unbiassed conclusion. "I do not believe (says Ranke) that Charles V. even so much as asked himself the question what side he ought to espouse;" but he allied himself with Rome in the presence of an urgent necessity, and it is remarkable how all his foreign relations conspired to confirm him in this resolution. His family honour forbad his listening to the doubt whether the court of Rome could abrogate the marriage of Henry VIII. The restoration of his exiled brother-in-law, Christien, to Sweden, where the notions of reform had gained ground, pointed to Catholic alliances as most advantageous. The situations of Switzerland and Hungary supplied the like induce-

ments; for Germany, too, he had much to gain from an union with the spiritual princes, upon whom the imperial authority so greatly depended; "for Zwingle once truly said that the empire and the papacy were so closely interwoven that it was impossible to make war upon one without attacking the other." The result of all these circumstances was, Ranke adds, that the emperor's policy was totally different from that which would have been agreeable to the German nation. He meditated a reconciliation with the Pope: the exaltation of the imperial power, but solely on the established hierarchical basis: resistance to the Ottomans, but entirely in the usual spirit of Latin Christendom: he had no sympathy with the German ideas of Church reform, and he determined to extinguish them.

In estimating this conduct of Charles, however, we must recollect his Spanish education. He had passed the important years of adolescence, in which a man enters definitively upon the path which he pursues through life in Spain, and imbibed the ideas prevalent there, where the state of the middle ages, in which the attributes of the monarchy and the priesthood were combined, was still in full vigour. Spain sought, too, to colonise even, for the Catholic religion. Such was the wish of Columbus; and his successors, in the midst of robberies and acts of unheard-of cruelty, yet showed the most ardent zeal for the extension of the religion of Rome. Such exceptions as Antonio de Lebrixa ("who deserves to be classed with Erasmus and Reuchlin,") and Ximenes, were too rare to affect the bigotry of the whole nation. Hence it was that in Spain—as is the case, indeed, in every country—a moral atmosphere prevailed from which there was no escape; and it was impossible for the young emperor, surrounded by such influences as these, to acquire energy and independence of mind. We may omit the circumstances of the Italian war, the peace of Cambray, the divorce of Henry VIII., as well known events—only adding that they served to divert the emperor's mind, whilst the seeds of the Reformation were springing up in Germany, unmolested by his antipathies, which would otherwise have actively manifested themselves.

Ranke commences the important chapter on the "Diet of Spires, A.D. 1529," with this sentence:—

"We have seen how great was the influence of *political* affairs in the rise and progress of religious reform: had it not been for the divisions existing between the two highest powers of Europe, the decisive resolutions of the Diet of 1526 would never have passed."

The vast value of this Diet was spoken of in this journal

(No. xliv, p. 349). Since that, other assemblies had met without producing any useful decisions; but, in consequence of the Pope's brief of October, 1528, urging the emperor to take up the cause of religion at the approaching Diet, one was appointed to be holden at Spires on the 21st of February, 1529.

The States were apprised that those who came would act irrespective of the opinions of the absent ones. The subjects specially announced for discussion were, the armament against the Turks, the violations of the public peace, and the religious innovations. The composition of this Diet, which is thus described by Ranke, plainly foreshadowed its decision:—

"This time the announcement of the Diet was serious and sincere, the imperial commissioners made their appearance at the time appointed: the ecclesiastical princes came in greater numbers than usual, and those who did not come sent the most zealous of their ministers in their stead. The Bishop of Constance, for example, was represented by the same Faber who took an active part in the political and religious troubles of Switzerland. He had seen Erasmus in his way, and expressed himself in such terms that the latter expected nothing but war and violence. The Catholic principle had also gained new adherents among the secular princes. Duke Henry of Mecklenburg, who had hitherto been reckoned among the evangelical party, now entirely concurred with his son Magnus, Bishop of Schwerin, one of the most violent opposers of the change. The Elector Palatine, who had formally joined the reformers, forbade his people to attend the preachings. It was thought that he had been persuaded to take this course by his brother, the Count Palatine Frederic."

Under such circumstances, surrounded by all that was favourable to their wishes, the imperial commissioners were enabled to bring forward measures of a decisive nature in the proposition which they delivered on the 15th of March. Whilst they promised in the Pope's name a general council, they proposed to revoke the article of the recess of 1526, in virtue of which all existing innovations were recognised and admitted.

A committee was appointed to deliberate upon this proposition, in which the orthodox were far the more numerous party. Among the electoral votes only that of Saxony was on the evangelical side: of the nine princes' votes, five were ecclesiastical, and three of the secular were decidedly Catholic. On the 24th of March the committee declared its assent, adding the following provisions:—

"Those who had held to the edict of Worms should continue to do so: in the districts which had departed from it no further inno-

vation should be introduced, and no one should be prevented from saying mass. No ecclesiastical body should be deprived of its authority or revenues on pain of ban and re-ban. Lastly, the sects which deny the sacraments of the true body and blood of Christ should in no wise be tolerated any more than the Anabaptists."

With these additions, the report was laid before the State. A specimen of the opposition with which this met is afforded by the delegates of the cities, who remarked in the committee that Faber had worked upon the princes by exaggerating the dangerous consequences of former concessions. The reply to Faber was, that Germany was indebted for the tranquillity she enjoyed to that very recess which they were now required to revoke; and if, in these hasty times, they were to pass resolutions of such gravity, directly opposed to the former, nothing could be expected to result but division and indescribable perplexities and evils. As yet the cities were unanimous—those which had remained Catholic as well as those which had become Protestant.

Vainly did Count Palatine Frederic represent to the reformers their disobedience to the imperial edict, and that they were but increasing the troubles. They rejected the charge of intentional or actual insubordination, appealing to the inalienable right of conscience, and affirming their objects to be pacific. King Ferdinand entreated them, two or three times, to gratify the emperor. They replied—"They would obey the emperor in all that could further the maintenance of peace and the honour of God."

Notwithstanding, however, the greatness of the majority, they did not think it right to disregard altogether so strong a resistance; but, as no important concessions were made, it remained for the evangelical party* to consider whether they should allow a resolution which threatened them with destruction to acquire the validity of law. A bold stand against it was made by Minkwitz, the Saxon envoy, in the full assembly of the empire. He affirmed that in affairs of conscience the majority had no force, and asked by what right the Diet presumed to pronounce their doctrines as unchristian, upon which a council had to be called? But remonstrances were vain; and on the 19th of April, King Ferdinand, Waldkirch, and the other commissioners, appeared in the assembly of the States, thanked them for their "Christian, faithful, and assiduous services,"

* In the frequent use of this designation of the reformers, we have taken it for granted that it is not confounded with the term as applied to religious parties in England. Mrs. Austin somewhere calls attention to this.

and declared their resolutions accepted; so that there only remained to reduce them to the form of a recess. We give what follows in Ranke's own words:—

"The evangelical princes, startled at so direct a refusal which had the air of reproof—and, as it was read aloud before all the States, must be entered on the records of the empire—retired for a moment into an adjoining room in order instantly to agree upon some answer. But the king and the imperial commissioners were not disposed to wait for this. In reply to a request of the princes, that they would not refuse a short delay, King Ferdinand said that he had received the positive commands of his Imperial Majesty: these he had executed, and so the matter must remain: the articles were determined on. So saying, he and the commissioners left the house. Still more irritated by the contempt for their dignity and their rights which this conduct implied, the evangelical States now determined to execute a project, which they had conceived some weeks before, as soon as they saw the turn affairs were taking at the Diet. They resolved to resort to the only legal means of resistance left them: it was evidently impossible to make the assembly recede from its resolutions; and, to submit to them, would be to renounce their own existence. They re-appeared at the same sitting—not, indeed, before the king and the imperial commissioners, but before the States still assembled—and caused that protest to be read aloud, from which they took the name their descendants still bear—Protestants."

There is sufficient enthusiasm in Ranke's version of this great struggle for liberty and its issue, together with a sobriety, which gives it the appearance of what it really was—a *human* transaction. From the tone and manner of some declaimers, the astonished reader must conclude that the actors were angels, and not frail men, whose motives were a mixture of the human and divine. Their calmness and wisdom, indeed, may impart to many modern reformers lessons teaching the only path to true success. Upon the character and form of the protest, Ranke remarks:—

"This declaration, the mere form of which is most remarkable, was expressed with all possible external deference and courtesy. The States were all spoken of as 'our dear lords, cousins, uncles, and friends.' They were entitled, with the most careful attention to their several distinctions, 'you, well-beloved, and you, others.' To the former were addressed 'friendly requests—to the latter, 'gracious considerations;' and, while they do not for an instant lose sight of their princely dignity, they beg their opponents not to misunderstand the course which they feel themselves compelled to adopt; in return they promise the former to deserve this by their friendship; and the latter, to requite it by their good will."

The king rejected this protest; but it made an immense

impression, and two mediators were appointed. Upon some important points both parties came to an agreement—for example, to tolerate their differences as to the service of the mass: but upon one essential particular the reformers took their stand, and refused to give way—viz., against the influence of the spiritual jurisdiction which had been recognized anew by the Diet. Hence the king refused to allow the protest to be incorporated in the recess, or in any way to be noticed; and, on the other hand, the evangelical princes disregarded Ferdinand's request, not to give it further extension or publicity.

"A formal instrument, with all the documents annexed, was drawn up, in which the United Provinces, Elector John of Saxony, Margrave George of Brandenburg (and others), appealed from the wrongs and offences done to them at the Diet to the emperor, the next free assembly of holy Christendom, or to a congress of the German nation. . . . . On the following Sunday, April 25th, the necessary form was given to this manifesto. This took place (for the spot is pointed out with an accuracy worthy of notice) in the lodging of Chaplain Peter Mutterstadt, near St. John's Church, at Spires, in St. John's Lane of the same, in the little room on the ground floor. It was immediately made public, having acquired additional weight from the signatures of a great number of the imperial cities."

And now comes the next chapter, which is also the next in the history of all reforming revolutions—"Dissentions among the Reformers." The fact, however, that has puzzled and distressed so many sincere minds is explained in one sentence by Ranke: the discussions of the Diet of Spires, in 1529, turned rather on a question of public law (in which the reformers all agreed) than on any points of doctrine (on which there were wider disagreements).

Now, however, when the storm was over and the ecclesiastical body had reunited in defence of its common interests—and when the emperor had once more allied himself with the papacy—the Catholic party succeeded in getting possession of the supreme power; and thus the evangelical party suddenly saw itself, not only excluded from all share in the government of the empire (which it had for some years mainly conducted), but threatened in its very existence. Nothing remained for these princes, therefore, but to organize themselves, as a minority, determined to brook no oppressive and compulsory measures.

Upon this important decision Ranke remarks—"It must never be forgotten that the noble and courageous idea of taking up this defensive position—of intrenching themselves behind the laws of the empire—an idea from which the whole subsequent development of Protestantism resulted—was founded on the

union of the confessions of Saxony and of Switzerland." The explanation of this is thus given. On the 21st of April, King Ferdinand refused the mediation of Brunswick and Baden: on the 22nd, Saxony and Hessen concluded a particular secret agreement with the cities of Nuremberg, Ulm, and Strasburg, of which the *first* adhered to Lutheran opinions, and the *last* to those of Zwingle.

But the Protestant League thus formed was soon broken by theological scruples arising from the two confessions, which were at first kept out of sight; but the imaginary evil was soon seen and felt. "Melancthon, a man who with patient and unwearied labour worked out in his own mind every difficult problem that came before him," returned home robbed of his accustomed cheerfulness. He thought that, by abandoning Zwingle's adherents, the Lutherans would have been able to influence the majority. "My soul (says he, in a letter on the 11th of June) is possessed by such bitter grief that I neglect the duties of friendship and all my studies." Again, on the 14th, he writes, "I feel myself in such disquiet that I had rather die than endure it longer." As if to remedy his neglect, he at length put his friends in Nuremberg on their guard against conducting the projected treaty; "for (said he), the godless opinions of Zwingle must on no account be defended." Luther joined in this opinion, and asked—"Shall we dare to connect ourselves with people who strive against God and the holy sacrament? We shall thus go to perdition, body and soul."

Concerning such painful dissensions between those who ought to have been close friends, we must embrace Ranke's wise conclusion:—

"It can hardly be affirmed that these theological scruples ought to have been utterly disregarded, or that Luther was to be blamed for entertaining them. We must consider that the whole Reformation originated in religious convictions which admit of no compromise, no condition, no extenuation. The spirit of an exclusive orthodoxy, expressed in rigid formulæ and denying salvation to its antagonists, now ruled the world. Hence the violent hostility between two confessions which in some respects approximated so nearly. An union of their respective followers could only be rendered possible either by disregarding their differences or putting an end to them."

A conference was now proposed to be held at Marburg between the two parties. If the advantages at first proposed by this meeting did not follow, yet others did. Zwingle, who had been accused of errors concerning the divinity of Christ, on the doctrine of original sin on which the whole scheme of redemp-

tion rests, on the efficacy of the external word, and on baptism as being not a mere symbol, were now retracted. And it is certain, says Ranke, that Zwingle, in his endeavours to make out the meaning of Scripture for himself, had departed widely from the received opinions of the Church on all these points; and in this respect, like Luther, he reverted to the fundamental basis of the Latin Church. He recanted all other errors, but on the eucharist he was inflexible. The dispute rested upon the word "is" in the declaration,—"This *is* my body." The difference between them, says Ranke, was this—"Zwingle regarded the presence of Christ as connected with the bread; whereas Luther regards the bread itself as the very presence—the present body; the visible containing the invisible, as the scabbard contains the sword."

Ranke thinks that, with a view to the progressive development of religious ideas, it was not to be wished that Zwingle should have given up his theory, which, by continually referring to the original and historical character of the institution of the great mystery, was of such immense importance to the whole conception of Christianity, independent of the Church, as actually constituted. Nor does he wish that Luther had relinquished his opinion on the indwelling of the divine element, generally held in the Church, though it is the same as that of the Catholics—only he rejects in it the numerous incidents handed down from fantastical or sophistical ages. He reverts to the original sources, to which the Catholics also refer, and receives nothing but what he finds there. Of the seven sacraments he finds and retains only two; but to them he adheres in spite of every attempt to wrest them from him, or to detract from their mysterious import. As has been remarked, these are two views of the subject taken from different points, but equally inevitable.

The conference at Marburg will for ever be memorable and important for establishing a common basis for the progress of reform; for, in the first place, all the more important articles of faith in which they agreed were drawn up, and copied by the theologians of both parties; and the deviations from the Roman confession are carefully stated in it, as well as those from the Anabaptist sects. But yet their disagreement on one point nullified their agreement on fourteen others. There was no dispute as to the nature and the mode of the solemn rite, nor on its purpose, in so far that both believed that the true body and blood of Christ were spiritually taken: the only point in dispute was, whether this true body is bodily in the bread.

This difference, however, made the reformers henceforth a

divided body, unable to defend themselves; for Luther absolutely refused to extend brotherly love to the sacramental dissidents. "The mystery, the central point of the Christians' faith and service, he thought far too essential to admit of such a concession."

We state the conclusion of all their discussions and the dissolution of the Protestant League in Ranke's own words:—

> Thus, a few months sufficed to put an end to a league which seemed destined to convulse Europe. It was entirely dissolved: even the territorial alliance did not seem able to afford protection against the emperor. We perceive that the several States and Sovereigns thought themselves again bound to act and suffer single-handed. It is very easy to repeat the censure that has been often thrown upon this decision. It was certainly not the part of political prudence; but never was a course of action more purely conscientious—more regardless of personal consequences—more grand and magnanimous. These noble men (the reformers) saw the enemy (the Emperor with the Papacy) approach: they heard his threats: they were under no delusion as to his views: they were almost persuaded that he would attempt the worst against them. They had an opportunity of forming a league against him that would shake Europe, at the head of which they might oppose a formidable resistance to his projects of universal dominion and make an appeal to fortune; but they would not: they disdained the attempt—not out of fear or mistrust of their own strength and valour: these are considerations unknown to souls like theirs. They were withheld by the power of religion alone. First, because they would not mix up the defence of faith with interests foreign to it, nor allow themselves to be hurried into things that they could not foresee. Secondly, they would defend no faith but that which they themselves held: they would have feared to commit a sin if they connected themselves with those who differed from them—in one point only, it is true, but that one of the highest. Lastly, they doubted their right to resist their sovereign and head, and to trouble the long-established order of the empire. Thus, in the midst of the jarring interests of the world, they took up a position counselled only by God and their own consciences, and there they calmly awaited the danger. 'For God is faithful and true (says Luther), and will not forsake us.' He quotes the words of Isaiah—'Be ye still and ye shall be holpen.'"

We agree with Ranke's opinion of this course—"Unquestionably, this is not prudent, but it is great."

We pass over the next chapter—"The Ottomans before Vienna"—remarking only that it is an admirable concentration of one of the remarkable episodes of history; and also chapter eighth, describing "Charles V. in Italy," in order that we may again find ourselves in the presence of the great reli-

gious events of the day in chapter nine, which treats of "The Diet of Augsburg, 1530."

By the treaty of Barcelona the emperor had bound himself to endeavour, in the first place, to bring back the dissidents to the faith; and, if that attempt should fail, then to apply all his power to "avenge the insult offered to Christ." This is the key to all the proceedings on his side at this Diet. The opinion which the papal legate, Campeggi, delivered to him, is founded on the same ideas. He begins by suggesting promises, threats, alliances, with the Catholic States; and, in case these means should prove unavailing, then he insists upon resorting to force—to "fire and sword"—to the confiscation of property, and to the vigilance of an inquisition, like that in Spain.

It is to be remarked, however, that the emperor's convocation to the Diet of Augsburg was highly pacific: he announced his desire "to allay divisions; to leave all past errors to the judgment of our Saviour; and, further, to give a charitable hearing to every man's thoughts, opinions, and notions; to weigh them carefully; to bring men to Christian truth; to dispose of everything that has not been rightly explained on both sides." This document was dated from the palace in which the emperor was then living with the popes. The Catholics, at least, understood that these words meant sharp daggers, though they were "smoother than butter." The advantages, too, of the emperor's actual presence were sure to manifest themselves in individual cases: for example, King Christien of Denmark, who had hitherto "adhered to Luther, constantly corresponded with him, and openly declared himself in favour of his doctrines," was persuaded at Innspruck to return to the Romish faith. The value of this recantation was, probably, overrated, and therefore it would even injure the Catholic cause. But certainly, at this time, circumstances of many kinds seemed propitious to the emperor's designs. The smooth words of the invitation caught the Protestants; and the most important personage amongst them, the Elector of Saxony, was the first who arrived at Augsburg: others followed. The emperor set out from Innspruck on the 6th of June, and reached the bridge over the Eck, before Augsburg, on the evening of the 15th. Here the most brilliant assemblage of princes of the empire met him; but, even here, at their first meeting, the great and all-dividing question presented itself in all its abruptness. The emperor called aside Landgrave Philip, and two others, and "requested them to put an end to the preachings." "Sire (said the old Margrave George), rather than renounce God's word, I will kneel down on

this spot and have my head cut off." The emperor, alarmed at such a threat, said, in his broken low German, "Dear prince, not heads off" *(nicht köpfe aff)*. The next difficulty was that the Protestants declined taking part in the procession of Corpus Christi on the following day. The emperor demanded this compliance "in honour of Almighty God." This they declined on the grounds of conscience; though, had it been a mere court service, the example of Naaman might have reconciled them to it.

On the 20th of June the Diet was opened, and the proposition, which was then read, insisted on an adequate armament against the Turks; at the same time the emperor declared his intention to put an end to the religious dissensions by gentle and fair means, and requested the opinions of others in writing.

They proceeded at once to the consideration of religious affairs, and the Protestants drew up a statement of their religious opinions to be laid before the States of the Empire. This statement is the celebrated "Augsburg Confession."

At the risk of making a longer quotation than usual in this summary of Ranke's opinions and sentiments, we cannot omit his account of this important matter:—

"The articles were revised and drawn up afresh (those settled at Marburg were the basis) by Melancthon, in that sound and methodical spirit peculiar to him, and in the undeniable intention of approximating as closely as possible to the Catholic doctrines. The expositions of the doctrines of free-will and of justification by faith which he added were extremely moderated: he defined at greater length what were the heretical errors (errors also rejected by the Church of Rome) condemned by the articles: he sought to establish these articles, not only by the authority of Scripture, but on that of the fathers, and especially St. Augustine: he did not entirely forbid the honours paid to the memory of the saints, but only endeavoured to define their extent more accurately: he insisted strongly on the dignity of the temporal power; and concluded with the assertion that these doctrines were not only clearly established in Scripture, but also that they were not in contradiction with the Church of Rome, as understood by the writings of the fathers, from whom it was impossible to dissent and who could hardly be accused of heresy."

Upon this important document, the produce of Melancthon's maturest thoughts, Ranke thus continues:—

"Indeed, it cannot be denied, I think, that the system of faith here set forth is a product of the vital spirit of the Latin Church, that it keeps within the boundaries presented by that Church, and is, perhaps, of all its offspring, the most remarkable, the most profoundly significant. It bears, as was inevitable, the traces of its origin—that is, the fundamental idea from which Luther had proceeded in the article of justifi-

cation, giving it somewhat of an individual stamp: this, however, is inherent in all human things. The same fundamental idea had more than once arisen in the bosom of the Latin Church, and had produced the most important effects: the only difference was, that Luther had seized upon it with all the energy of religious aspiration; and in his struggle with opposite opinions, as well as in his expositions to the people, had established it as an article of faith of universal application: no human being could say that, so explained and understood, this idea had anything sectarian in it Hence the Lutherans steadily opposed the more accidental dogmas which have sprung up in later ages: though not disposed to ascribe to the expressions of a father of the Church absolute and demonstrative authority, the reformers were conscious that they had not departed widely from his conception of Christianity. There is a tacit tradition, not expressed in formulæ, but contained in the original nature of the conception, which exercises an immense influence over all the operations of the mind. The reformers distinctly felt that they stood on the old ground which Augustine had marked out. They had endeavoured to break through the minute observances by which the Latin Church had allowed itself to be fettered in the preceding centuries, and to cast away those bonds altogether: they had recurred to the Scripture, to the letter of which they adhered; but they did not forget that it was the same Scripture which had been so long earnestly studied in the Latin Church, and had been regarded as the standard of her faith; nor that much of what that Church received was really founded in Scripture. To that they adhered—the rest they disregarded."

We are persuaded that there is a depth of wisdom in the above long quotations which will amply repay a careful examination.

In a similar spirit of wisdom and conciliation, Melancthon wrote the second part. He confined himself strictly to a justification of the ecclesiastical organization to which the reference had, by degrees, attained. He explained the grounds of the sacrament in both kinds—of the marriage of the clergy—of the individual voluntary adoption of fasts and the confession, and of the rejection of private masses and vows. He sought to show, in general, how new and dangerous were the practices of the Romanists, and how at variance with the old canonical rules.

On the afternoon of the 25th of June, 1530, this wise and conciliatory confession was read aloud in the assembly of the empire, not in the Latin version, as the emperor wished, but in the German one, they being, as the princes boldly observed, on German ground.

The evangelical princes looked for a similar declaration of faith from their adversaries; and at length it was determined to advise the emperor to authorize a confutation of the confession; and, in the meanwhile, an attempt might be made to arrange

the differences between the temporal and spiritual estates. The emperor acted on this advice, and thus the situation of the Protestants was changed greatly for the worse. Till now, they had expected from the emperor a fair appreciation of their conduct, and mediation between them and their adversaries. But they soon discovered that the stream flowed wholly against them.

The confutation was set about with great zeal; and it bears the marks of the effect produced on the minds of the Catholic writers by a study of Melancthon's masterly exhibition of Scripture truths—for example: "A nearer approach was made to the more profound conception of justification through Christ, which has since been almost universally adopted. If the Catholics strove to retain the doctrine of the necessity of good works, it was in a different sense from that heretofore affixed to it." But upon the old externals they remained stedfast—transubstantiation—the seven sacraments—the denial of the cup to the laity, and the like. But they showed their weakness by resorting to the false decretals. It is not, perhaps, generally known that they defended the use of the ritual in the Latin tongue, on the ground that the officiating priest belonged far more to the *whole Church* than to the *particular congregation* by which he happened to be surrounded.

At the end of the confutation the emperor admonished the evangelical party to return to their obedience to the Roman and Catholic Church: if not, he must proceed against them as became a Roman emperor, and the protector and steward of the Church.

The time for mildness was now over, and Charles assumed the sternest deportment.

"The might and energy of Latin Christendom was once more exhibited to the world in the person of the emperor. By his brilliant victories he had secured universal peace: even from the Ottoman power he had nothing to dread during the present, or probably the coming, year. The papal authority, as well as the collective power of the States of the Empire was on his side. On the other hand the Protestants had no religious, or political, support in any quarter; nor had they even the internal strength which a firm bond of union would have given them. It might be doubted (Ranke continues) whether German princes and lords, trained in the chivalrous life of courts and converted to the new doctrines by strangers—to whom a good understanding with their neighbours, and, in their more important affairs, the favour of the emperor, were indispensable—would have sufficient constancy to maintain their opinions in defiance of his express displeasure and frown. The immediate decision of this question depended upon the most lenient and powerful among them—to whom the others looked up and against whom the emperor chiefly directed his attacks—the Elector John of Saxony."

We wish we had space to give more at length Ranke's beautiful portrait of this admirable specimen of human nature under the garb of a prince. We must present, however, only a few features. He was from childhood, as Luther said, "without guile and evil," and full of that moral earnestness which gives weight and dignity to simplicity of character. He was not born for the amusements and dissipations of the world: the disgust which inevitably attends them made too deep an impression on him, and gave him more pain than pleasure. John embraced Luther's doctrines from the first; and his greatest enjoyment was to have the Scriptures, which he now heard, for the first time, read aloud to him in an evening. Sometimes he fell asleep, for he was already far advanced in years; but he awoke repeating the last verse that had dwelt on his memory. Ranke says he knows of no prince to whom a larger portion of the merit of the establishment of the Protestant Church can be justly ascribed. He introduced into Germany the first evangelical form of Church government, which, in a greater or less degree, served as a model for others. Indeed, when the hour of real trial came on, Luther affirms that, if John had wavered, not one of his council would have stood firm. But, proceeds Ranke, his simple and straight-forward mind viewed the questions laid before him in so clear and direct a light that his decision was inevitable. "Either deny God or the world (said he). Who can doubt which is better? God has made me an elector of the empire, a dignity of which I never was worthy: let him do for me further according to his good pleasure."

During this period Luther was at Coburg, and, as represented by Ranke, he stands forth as truly great. No threats of the emperor moved him one step:—

"He could not think of receding one step. Day and night, said he, I live in these things. I search the Scriptures, I reflect, I discuss: I daily feel increasing certainty: I will not allow mine to be taken from me, let what God wills befall me in consequence. His intrepidity is solely the result of his persuasion that his cause is the cause of God. The Lord dwelleth in the midst: he hath his dwelling-place in the darkness. Man seeth not what is; but he will be the Lord, and he shall see it. And if we are not worthy, it will be brought to pass by others. Have our forefathers made us what we are? God alone, who shall be the Creator after us as he was before us, causes it to be with us even as it is. For he, the God that ruleth the thoughts, will not die with us. If the enemy put me to death, I shall be better avenged than I could desire: there will be one who will say, Where is Abel thy brother?"

As Ranke observes, a determined will has always the power

of carrying others along with it. What, then, could resist such a will as Luther's?

All the other princes vied with Elector John in firmness. As an example, Wolfgary of Anhalt, though by no means a powerful prince, said, nevertheless, with the greatest calmness, "Many a time have I taken horse in the cause of my good master and friends; and my Lord Christ deserves that I should venture something for him also."

The cities also proved themselves equal to the princes. Thus, the delegates of Nuremberg said—"Our mind is not to give way; for, by so doing, we should put the emperor's favour above that of God: God, we doubt not, will grant us stedfastness." "Your Grace (write the Councillors of Magdeburg to the Elector of Saxony) stands, carrying on a perilous struggle in the affairs of Christendom, under the banner of the Saviour: we pray to God daily to grant you patience and strength."

Things had now assumed a distinct shape in Germany. The majority, with the emperor at their head, meditated force, and Italian troops were relied on. On the opposite side was an unorganised minority. But there was another element that forced itself into their calculations: while civil war reigned at home, might not a Turkish invasion be contemplated as almost certain to take place, as it would then be certain of success? The Elector of Mainz made this suggestion, and it produced a deep impression. Hence there was an "attempt of the States to mediate;" and, on the 16th of August, a conference was opened, in which two princes, two doctors of the canon law, and three theologians of each party, took part, and which soon appeared to promise great results.

One or two points in this discussion may be adduced to show how mere *words* so often constitute the difference between men whose thoughts and opinions are nearly the same.

"On the article of 'Original Sin,' Eck gave way as soon as Melancthon proved to him that an expression objected to in his definition was, in fact, merely a popular explanation of an ancient scholastic one. Respecting the article of 'Justification through Faith Alone,' Wimpina expressly declared that no work was meritorious if performed without grace: he required the union of love with faith: and only in so far he objected to the word 'alone.' In this sense, however, the Protestants had no desire to retain it: they consented to its erasure: their meaning had always been merely that a reconciliation with God must be effected by inward devotion, not by outward acts. On the other hand, Eck declared that the satisfaction which the Catholic Church required to be made by penitence was nothing else than reformation—an explanation which certainly left nothing further to be objected to the doctrine of the necessity of satisfaction."

These were not the only advances made by the Protestants to the Church of Rome. But the truth is, the affair had been already discussed and decided at the papal court. And for what other purpose could such a party have entered into discussion at all but to entice or throw dust in the eyes of its adversary, when, by the mouth of the papal legate, Campeggi, it maintained that "all the ordinances of the Church were immediately dictated by the Holy Ghost?" The Protestant party had conceded all that their religious convictions permitted, and they refused to advance one step further. It was impossible, however, that the emperor should be induced to acquiesce in such a termination of the Diet, or to allow it to be broken up thus: he foresaw, in such an issue, a long train of still worse evils. He fell back, therefore, upon a council; and, after some correspondence with the Pope, the emperor sent a message to the Protestants, on the 7th of September, announcing a council; but he spoilt all by adding "that they must, in the interval, conform to the faith and practice of the Emperor, the States, and the universal Christian Church."

It seems impossible to believe that Charles was unprepared for the result of this. The Protestants replied "that to comply with such a demand would be to run counter to God and their consciences." They showed, too, that such a requirement was illegal. Charles deeply felt this issue and says, in one of his letters, that he cannot describe the vexation the affair causes him:—

"Clinging tenaciously to the idea of the Latin Church, and animated by a chivalrous sort of ambition, he had hoped to triumph over all his enemies. Instead of this, he was himself involved in a dispute the very grounds of which were unintelligible to him."

The States, however, submitted a project of a recess, which held out threats of war: the Protestants were to be allowed time till next 5th of May in order to explain themselves; but this was unfortunately couched in too offensive terms to be received in a favourable spirit. It was said:—

"They must compel no one to join their sect—the word and the theory were equally odious to them: it contained ordinances to which they did not think themselves at liberty to submit—*e. g.*, not to allow anything relating to matters of faith to be printed within the period assigned, and to allow monks to confess and say mass; and, lastly, it was expressly asserted that the confession had been confuted with arguments drawn from holy Scripture."

They rejected it without a moment's hesitation, and thus the parties separated. The rupture, which had been hitherto

concealed beneath the hope of reconciliation, was soon laid bare to view. A complete separation had taken place among the princes of the empire, and the division had already extended to the cities. One instance may suffice:—In Augsburg the emperor's presence, of course, caused much embarrassment, and it was thought necessary to revert to the extraordinary measure of convoking the great council, in which members of all the guilds took part; but the Protestant spirit had already penetrated the body of the citizens too deeply for them to find it possible to renounce the confession. In the very face of the confessor, Augsburg refused to accept the recess.

Other matters yet remained to be settled at this Diet, which proved to the confessor the independent position assumed by all the German States in matters which concerned even their temporal welfare. But the most important question was, what attitude the emperor and the majority would assume in their relations with the States which had rejected their recess? The emperor's warlike disposition may be learnt from a letter dated 25th of October to the cardinals, in which he says:—

"We declare to you that, for the termination of this affair (with the Lutherans), we will spare neither kingdoms nor dominions: nay, that we will devote to it body and soul, which we have wholly dedicated to the service of God Almighty."

There is a pause here in Ranke's division of his great work. With the termination of the Diet of Augsburg he closes the fifth book. The sixth book is devoted to an examination of the "Origin and Progress of the Schmalkaldic League," embracing the period, 1530-1535. Few minds are so barren as not to have some thoughts and opinions which they would like to give utterance to upon the mighty events which have just been made to pass in array before us; but our task is the humbler one of recording the thoughts of the historian.

ART. III.—*The Isle of Man: its History, Physical, Ecclesiastical, Civil, and Legendary.* By the Rev. JOSEPH GEORGE CUMMING, M.A., Vice-Principal of King William's College, Castletown. London: John Van Voorst. 1848.

"READER (says Southey, in a chapter of 'The Doctor,' treating upon the moral interest of topographical works and local attachment)—Reader (says he), if thou carest little or nothing for the Yorkshire river Don, and for the town of Doncaster, and for the circumstances connected with it, I am sorry for thee." Southey's venerable friend Dr. Dove was, as he tells us, of a

different disposition: he was one who loved as Southey himself loved:—

> "——— uncontrollable as in a stream,
> To muse upon the course of human things;
> Exploring sometimes the remotest springs,
> Far as tradition leads one guiding gleam;
> Or following upon Thought's audacious wings
> Into futurity the endless stream."

Dr. Dove, as his quaint biographer informs us, could not only find—

> "——— tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

But, we are told, he endeavoured to find all he could in them; and for that reason he delighted to enquire into the history of places and of things, and to understand their past as well as their present state. The revolutions of a mansion-house within his circuit were as interesting to him as those of the Mogul empire; and, as Southey concludes by telling us, he had as much satisfaction in being acquainted with the windings of a brook, from its springs to the place where it fell into the Don, as he could have felt in knowing that the source of the Nile had been explored, or the course and termination of the Niger.

We confess to something of the spirit which, in this wise, animated the immortal doctor; and it is because of this that we accordingly and heartily greet a work which, in brief space and happy phrase, tells us of the Isle and Kingdom of Man, of its fortunes, its church, its condition, aspect, traditions, and hopes. It is extraordinary how very little we know of this interesting island—of this real gem of the Irish Sea—whose fate it has been ever to be set in the crown of a stranger. We possess, generally, a world more of knowledge touching localities not half so well worth knowing, and in which we ought to be infinitely less interested. The isles of the Ægean or the Mediterranean are, in their ancient history at least, as pages which we have by rote; but who amongst us is a tithe as familiar with the legendary annals of Mona or Vectis? What have we not read, for instance, and that in our school days, of Chios? Plutarch, and Horace, and Strabo, and Mela were our tutors; and at their feet, even in our teens, we knew that Chione gave name to the isle; and that the proud daughter of Deucalion, so Naso tells us, was changed into a hawk for preferring her venal beauty to that of the chaste Diana; and it was early matter of perplexity to us to reconcile the virtues of a population, among whom the sin of adultery was not known for seven centuries,

with the vicious example set them by their great foundress who was, at one and the same time, the mistress of Apollo and Mercury! Our young memories are crowded with the names of the hundred cities of Crete—with examples of the wisdom of Minos—and the utter rascality of the people for whom he gave himself the vain trouble of being wise. And Delos—how familiarly are we all acquainted with the history of that magnificent lying-in hospital which Neptune created at a word for the reception of the light-robed and slender-reputed Latona? There is Paros, too: its Lychnite marbles are better known to us than any production of our own quarries. Do we not know that all the Ægeans were originally ants, and that they never exhibited half the industry and perseverance of their ancestors? Salamis—its glory and misfortunes are as household words in our mouths. Naxos, obeying kings, establishing a republic, and worshipping Bacchus, is as a story of yesterday; and Cyprus, with its nine kingdoms, its change of masters, its worship of Venus, its three temples, and the constancy which the people manifested in being inconstant—are not all these things written in Strabo, and Ptolemy, and Florus, and Justin; and do we not know volumes more about them than of Eubonia in the Hibernicum Mare, or of Vectis and the Solent?

And yet the histories of the Isle of Wight and of the Isle of Man are as full of pages replete with interest and moving incident as that of any island of ancient days, wherein unclean monarchs presided and unclean manners prevailed. The early annals of the former bristle with fierce aspects; and battles, of which we know little, were as plentiful as blackberries. Before the Solent, or the Solvent, Sea divided the Ictis of Diodorus from that portion of Britain which was then inhabited by the Belgæ or Regni, the Romans shipped their tin for Gaul from the harbours of the Undercliff. The whole story of the resistance given by the natives to the Roman invasion is worthy of better study than it receives at the hands or heads of ingenuous British youth; and of no less interest, though equally unknown "to the general," are the Saxon conquest; the bloody conversion of the inhabitants from Druidism, under the barbarous arguments of that ruthless missionary king, Cædwella, and the sanguinary rule maintained there by the Danes. Wight, like Man, was long an independent sovereignty. At the conquest, Fitz-Osborne subdued the island for his own use and profit, and became the first Lord of Wight; for two full centuries after the conquest, the Isle of Wight continued to be governed by its sovereign lords. In 1293 Edward I. purchased the regalities, and the King of England became thenceforth, "Lord of the

Island," governing the same by custodes or wardens. The person who sold the regalities was Isabella de Fortibus, "Lady of Wight." Thus it came by the sword and went with the distaff. The abdicating lady got six thousand marks (4,000*l.*) by the bargain; and, on the day she alienated the sovereignty from her family, she was suddenly visited by the inevitable angel and summoned to the narrower possession of the grave.

But the variety which characterises the annals of that little island in the English Channel, which is still yearly invaded by hordes of tourists, is monotony itself when compared with the ever-shifting scenes of Manx history. The very opening page of this history begins with the reign of a primitive king with a painful name: it is no other than Mannanan-beg-mac-y-Sheive, who was not only a king but a conjuror, and who deserves to be for ever immortal for declining to impose taxes upon his wondering and grateful people! A king who could maintain his state without a revenue drawn from the purses of his subjects was, of course, clever enough for anything; and, accordingly, we hear that he could "raise the wind"—not metaphorically—but in as destructively matter-of-fact style as old Æolus himself, for whose professional qualities we refer our readers to the well-known passage in Maro. No invader successfully visited the isle under the halcyon reign of this exemplary king; for the latter entrapped him into imaginary quagmires, affrighted him with visionary volcanoes got up for the nonce, or put him out of his reckoning ere he landed on the isle by snatching the latter from his sight and enshrouding it within a barrier of impervious mist. The solitary objection to this story is that it belongs to a legendary period, and no one appears called upon to believe a word about it—the more the pity: we would gratefully entertain reminiscences of a monarch who never levied a contribution upon his subjects, and who was never represented at his people's thresholds by that unpopular official, the district tax-gatherer, with his slip of odious paper and the not less odious intimation of

"Taxes (says he), and shall not call again!"

Out of this romance we step into grave realities; and we find the island monarchy falling into the hands of all sorts of people, save the Manx themselves: it has been ridden over by the Romans and held by the Scots: it has groaned under the Welsh sceptre and been subject to Irish mastery. The Icelander, the Norwegian, and the Dane have, by turns, held and lost it. It has in its day afforded a species of Schleswig-Holstein quarrel

for the arbitration of the English crown; and, after enduring or enjoying monarchy for a period longer than England has enjoyed the same condition (from the Heptarchy), was sold to her great eastern neighbour—and, oh wonder! has never once called out for a repeal of the union.

The record of all these matters is made at greater length by Mr. Cumming than we can venture to imitate. We can only give in a summary what he tells so well in detail, and, to do that, we plunge *in medias res.* That great knight-errant, Arthur of the Round Table, visited the island when it was held by the Scots, who had themselves succeeded to the Romans: this was in the year 520. Arthur drove out the foreigner, and in his place established a prince of the native line. In about twenty years the Scots returned, and kept their conquest until ejected by the King of Northumberland. Soon after this, Man was incorporated with the kingdom of North Wales, and only became again a sole and independent sovereignty when the Sovereign of Wales, like Charlemagne, divided his kingdom among his heirs, and left the island to one of his three sons. At this period we have reached the tenth century, when the Northmen appeared, and, like Cæsar, conquered where they looked; but these men came with laws as well as swords, and they established the House of Keys, and founded the ceremony of the Tynwald, and divided the island into six *sheadings* (*scheide*—division?). They were a magnificent race; and old Haco, in 973, appears to have been as great an admiral as he was a king. He is gravely reported to have possessed a fleet of three thousand six hundred ships, with which he kept the pirates, of a most piratical age, from the shores of England: and he was one of eight kings who conducted Edgar in the royal barge up the river Dee, Haco, as the chief of the eight, holding the royal helm. Haco gave to the island his own shield of arms—a ship in full sail. It was not for three hundred years that Man received the blazoning of which she still boasts. In 1273, Alexander III. of Scotland gave the island three legs for its arms, with the motto, *Quocunque jeceris stabit.* Sicily has a shield very much resembling this, but it cannot boast of the same significant motto. Man has, with all its changes, stood pretty firm upon its human tripod. Sicily is even now tottering on its three legs, and its new crown is going a-begging for want of a master to maintain it in steadiness.

It is not very clear whether the Northmen, who had established themselves in Man, were Icelanders or Danes—they were probably the latter: the same men established a sovereignty in Dublin, and during the eleventh century the sove-

reignty of Dublin and of Man was held by one and the same person. At this period the succession becomes more distinct; and, in 1066, we find Godred Conan, son of Harold the Black (an Icelander), running from the battle-field of Stamford-bridge, where the Saxon Harold so completely overcame his northern namesake, and taking refuge in Man. Godred liked his asylum so well that he seized upon it to his own use and profit, after first slaying the occupying king, Fingall, according to the manner of those primitive times. A curious consequence is told of this accession. His allies, the King of Dublin and two O'Briens (it is not said whether these were the royal ancestors of Smith O'Brien, "not yet" King of Munster), humbled the Scots to such a degree that no shipbuilder of that nation durst put above three bolts in any vessel which he constructed. The consequence does not seem logical, but it is thus reported. The Icelander was ultimately driven out by Magnus of Norway, and some kings of this Norwegian race ruled the destinies of Man from the dethronement of Cronan till the death of Magnus in 1265; and not one of them, as far as we can understand their story, died a natural death or lived a day in peace. At first, the kingdom was "the Kingdom of Man and the Isles;" but ultimately the Hebrides were forcibly divided from the dominion of Man, and the latter became once more a sole monarchy, but not an independent one, for King Reginald formally surrendered it to the Pope, Honorius; and, that he might the better wear his little crown in great tranquility, did homage for it to Henry III. of England. This is the first appearance in Manx annals of an English king. The act of homage, however, did not supersede the right of Norway; for the successors of Reginald paid fealty to the sovereign of the latter country, and perhaps there was little of real serious meaning in the act, for another king we find turning from both Norway and England and rendering homage to Scotland. The act gave no right: it merely purchased the protection of the power to whom it was paid. When the last king of the Norwegian race of Cronan died in 1265, his brother, Magnus of Norway, sold Man and the Hebrides to the King of Scotland for four thousand marks down, and an annual payment of one hundred marks as tribute *for ever!* "Ubi cras istud, aut unde petendum?"

Scotland ruled Man by a viceroyalty; but she had not held it for more than a quarter of a century when the insular regality, *parvula, sed non tuta*, was seized by Edward of England, of whom it was held by Baliol as a fief of the English crown. In the year 1305 it was the subject of a law-suit in the English Court of King's Bench, where the right of succession was de-

bated upon, as we have said—a sort of Schleswig-Holstein difficulty, touching the law of inheritance. None of the heirs benefitted much by the discussion; for the one in possession made the island over, by deed, to an English noble, Simon de Montacute, whose son mortgaged it to Antony Beck, Bishop of Durham and Patriarch of Jerusalem, upon whom Edward III. of England settled it for life. In 1343 the disputed succession was settled by the marriage of the rivals in the male and female line; and William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, having thus espoused Mary, the great-grand-daughter of Reginald the Norwegian, was solemnly crowned King of Man. In just half a century there was another change, and in 1393 the then Earl of Salisbury sold it to that William Scroope, Earl of Wiltshire, whose care-tuned tongue so affrighted the royal victim of Pontefract. Scroope himself lost it in six years by execution and attainder, when Henry IV. conferred the pocket-kingdom on Harry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, for the light service of carrying the sword of Lancaster at the coronation. But Harry Percy himself endured attainder, and, on his deprivation by Act of Parliament, it was conveyed to Sir John Stanley, upon the condition of performing suit and service by presenting a pair of hooded falcons to the King of England when the latter first wore the crown. The Stanleys (one of whom crowned Henry VII. on the field of Bosworth, and was created Earl of Derby for his gallantry) held the sovereignty of Man till the year 1505, when Thomas, Earl of Derby, resigned the regal title upon the sensible plea that, "to be a great lord, is more honourable than to be a petty king."

After this wise lord, the island was for some time governed by commissioners for heirs who succeeded during their minority, and the little sovereignty (for it was still so in effect) endured all the misfortunes which generally befall larger States similarly governed. The result was that, in 1595, the then heirs to the Stanley honours were all at hot feud touching the succession. Ferdinand Stanley, Earl of Derby and Lord of Man, died of poison administered to him by a foreign servant; and, as he left no male heir, but was represented by four daughters, his brother William claimed the sovereign lordship in opposition to his fiery nieces. The question was quite another Schleswig-Holstein question, not more quickly but less costlily determined. After years of fierce litigation, during which Queen Elizabeth held the island in trust, an act of compromise was agreed upon between the weary heirs, and in 1610 the lordship was settled on Earl William, who, like so many mortal men, having at length and with great difficulty obtained that for

which he had so eagerly striven, grew tired of it when gained, and made over the same to his eldest son, James, Lord Strange, for an annuity of 1,000*l.* Sovereignty was never sold so recklessly below prime cost!

This Lord Strange is gloriously immortal as that seventh Earl of Derby who sacrificed every possession but his honour for the sake of the Church and the advantage of his King. He lived a pious soldier, and died a martyred saint. The Puritans murdered him at Bolton. They misliked him for his nobility, hated him for his fidelity, and doubly execrated him for the triumphs he achieved over them in behalf of monarchy. His widow inherited nothing of her lord's but his castle in the Isle of Man (which she held out against the rebels), and her lord's undaunted spirit. She had shot, with scanty form or ceremony, that dastardly kinsman of hers, William Christian, with whom we have all been rendered familiar through the pages of "Peverel of the Peak," and who, for his own profit, had conspired against the castle. But the noble Charlotte de la Tremouille had not strength to keep what she had the will to maintain, and sorely against her heart and inclination did she surrender the castle and sovereignty to the regicide Parliament. This body, with a liberality like that of Mrs. Haller, which gave profusely what did not belong to the giver, rewarded the services of Fairfax with the sovereignty and revenues of that island which Gildas so quaintly calls the "Navel of the Irish Sea." But the day of the Restoration arrived, and when restoring was the fashion you may be sure the faithful Stanleys were not forgotten. They recovered their regalities as the king did his. In this noble family the lordship continued to reside in the male line until it fell into the ducal family of Atholl (Murray), through marriage with an heiress, herself descended of the female line. John, the fourth Duke of Atholl, and the last English subject who exercised sovereign rights in the island (his English title, as that of the present duke, was Lord Strange), sold the revenues of the island to the British Government for 70,000*l.* and an annuity of 2,000*l.* The Crown lost just so much by the bargain, and the duke was not satisfied, though he retained his title of "Lord," the manorial right, the privilege of nominating to the bishopric, the mines, minerals, and treasure-trove. There was little else worth having, and such as it was the Crown paid dearly for it. The succeeding duke spent the best years of his long ducal sway in petitioning the Government, until his perseverance was rewarded by a further grant of a fourth part of the revenues of the island, which uncertain income he afterwards wisely com-

muted for 3,000*l.* per annum *for ever*. This was in 1805, and the arrangement lasted just twenty years. In the year 1825 the late duke sold all his remaining interest to the Government for upwards of 400,000*l.*, and thus the ancient kingdom of Man became entirely vested in the British Crown, and the Queen of England is now sole and undisputed sovereign Lady of Mona and Manxmen!

In strict truth, her majesty, like Maria Theresa—"Rex noster!"—is King of Man, and, according to old custom, ought to be crowned as such within the island. "Est nempe jus ipsius insulæ, ut quisquis illius sit Dominus Rex vocetur, cui etiam fas est coronâ aurea coronari."

And thus we have told in short space the record of a long royalty: it has been all too briefly told, perhaps; but in these matters a reviewer is compelled to consult his means rather than his inclination. We have refrained from naming each king, or even reciting the principal events of each reign, because our object has been to show how the little kingdom passed from dynasty to dynasty, and not what passed under the individual monarch of each respective house. Nevertheless, there is something to be gathered worthy of repetition; and, first, in the legendary way, Mr. Cumming tells this story of Godred Cronan: he was called "Goddard with the White Hand:" he appears to have been tolerably strong-handed to boot: *ex. gra.*:—

"The famous granite boulder, weighing between thirty and forty tons, known by the name of Goddard Cronan's stone, stood close by (St. Mark's). It was broken up by the owner of the field about twenty years since. Some fragments of it are built into the parsonage. The old legend of the stone is, that Goddard lived with his termagant wife in a great castle on the top of Barruli. Unable to endure the violence of her tongue, he turned her unceremoniously out of doors. After descending the mountain some distance, imagining herself out of his reach, she turned round and began to rate him so soundly, at the full pitch of her voice, that in a rage he seized on this huge granite boulder, and hurling it with all his might he killed her on the spot."

Any of our readers who have visited Munich will probably remember having seen there a curious memorial of the athletic prowess of an ancestor of the reigning family (1409) called, from his agility, "Christopher the Leaper." Beneath the archway leading from the Chapel-court to the Fountain-court of the old palace lies a huge black stone, now chained to the wall, and which he is said to have lifted and hurled to a considerable distance. There are also three nails—Murray says one, but we have seen the three—stuck into the wall about twelve feet from the ground, marking the height reached *by his heel* in jumping.

King Goddard, with the strong hand, is famous also for an arbitrary act of un-settlement made by him with regard to the tenure of land in the island. After he had conquered the island, with infinite trouble and greater loss, he gave to his troops the option of dividing the isle amongst them for an inheritance, or of pillaging it and returning home with their booty. The majority, like red Republicans of Paris or Dublin, preferred the excitement and profits of pillage: a smaller portion determined on settlement: with these Goddard shared the southern part of the island, leaving the northern to the natives, on condition that they should all hold their land as tenants at will, and that none of their descendants should set up hereditary claim to any part. The property and revenue of the whole isle were thus vested in himself; and some centuries passed before the inhabitants, who had succeeded to their possessions by inheritance, became alarmed at the non-fixity of their tenure. It was not till James, the seventh, the great, and good Earl of Derby, succeeded to the sovereignty that the holders got relieved of their "tenure of a straw," if the change they got may be called a relief. They were persuaded to surrender all they held to the lord, and to receive it again from him on a lease for three lives. On the straw tenure they had inherited without claim to inheritance; but, by this lease system, they absolutely despoiled their prospective heirs. The thing was done, however; and as lives began to drop the people became disquieted, and the land itself fell into utter neglect and wretchedness. The general condition had long touched the heart of good old Bishop Wilson, who used all his influence successfully to obtain from James, the tenth earl, in 1703, an Act which has been well called the "Manx Magna Charta." It is otherwise known as the Act of Settlement; and its object was to perfect, settle, and confirm the tenants in their tenures. It passed the Keys and Council; and the bishop thus speaks in his diary of the share he had in bringing it about:—

"September 6, 1703.—Blessed be God for his favours! On this I was, I hope, a happy instrument in bringing the Lord of Man and his people to an agreement: his lordship having this day condescended to settle them upon a certain tenure, or rather to restore them to their ancient tenure, which has been uncertain for more than one hundred years. What the consequence may be, I know not; but this I know, that I have acted uprightly in the whole affair, which God be praised for."

The succession of widows is another circumstance bringing back the memories of the olden time. When the Norwegians of the south were engaged in civil war with the inhabitants of

the north—this was in the latter days of Cronan, when Magnus of Norway was seeking to despoil him of his conquest—a war in which both leaders were slain, and the island rendered all but desolate—in this war, the women of the south fought with such determined bravery and effect that, in memory of their deeds of arms, it was decreed, and the decree is still in force, that the widows in the south of the island should inherit one half of the property of their deceased husbands, while northern widows should be content to find consolation in the customary third. In describing the inhabitants of a southern district, Mr. Cumming says they are sufficiently well off not to be solicitous about anything better. This enviable and happy condition he attributes much to the absence of a poor-law on the island, and to the operation of the insular law just noticed, and to which the people are strongly attached, which gives power to the wife, or widow, rather, over a considerable moiety of her husband's goods, which she can dispose of and settle away independent of his wishes. "An unruly son (says the author), whom his father would cut short, may thus fall back securely upon the more tender feelings of his mother." By this, it would appear that the wife has claim upon half of the husband's property before death; and in regard to her applying such property to the relief of favourite and profligate sons, who, after they have squandered what they could, seek to share in the inheritance of their more prudent brothers—a very questionable law does it appear to us. "It has, however (adds the author), frequently kept family property together, and liberated estates which the dissipation of their fathers would have impoverished. Hence the affection of the islanders for this ancient law."

The Tynwald Mount is the "forum judiciale" of the island. The House of Keys may pass and the Council sanction; but no law so far progressed is the law of the isle until proclamation has been solemnly made from the Tynwald Hill. The House of Keys, it will be remembered, is the insular Parliament, and "keys" is the corruption of a Manx term signifying "taxes." The House of Keys, therefore, is an assembly whose vocation is to levy taxes, just as that is the peculiar vocation of more august assemblies in wider extended monarchies. It consists of just two dozen members, who are singularly enough called *Taxiaxi*—a ferociously significant word one would think, but in reality it has nothing to do with the levying of imposts. The Taxiaxi were, in primitive days, hostages to the lord of the island for their different clans. Originally their election was popular—that is to say, the people chose the original twenty-four, who met to deliberate for the good of the community; but since then

the twenty-four select themselves, or, in other words, when a vacancy occurs among them—for instance, on the death of a member—the twenty-three survivors then select two from among the people, and of these the governor makes election of one. As we have said, no law *is* law until the same be proclaimed from the summit of this ancient and interesting mount, the Tynwald. In old days this was done with most imposing ceremony, and even now, on every feast of St. John the Baptist, there is much solemnity observed: on that festival, and in the locality before named, proclamation in Manx and English is made of all the laws enacted by the insular Parliament during the year; after which the procession of clergy, senators, governors and people, returns to the church of St. John, from which it had set out, where the proclaimed laws receive the final signature of the governor, council, and taxiaxi or keys.

The history of the Church in Man is replete with interest, and the memorials of former days of ecclesiastical greatness are frequent and important. There are as many ruined churches, cathedrals, and monasteries on the island, as there are kist-vaens, cromlechs, and crumbling castles. The churchyard of Bradden, with its solitary Runic monument, at which Mr. Kemble's eyes would sparkle, reminds us of St. Branden, abbot and confessor, who died in the eleventh century. In the church, A.D. 1292, a synod was held in Bradden Church, by Mark, Bishop of Sodor, at which were enacted three dozen very stringent canons for the guidance and government of the Manx priesthood. The hair of reverend antiquaries will, we are sure, become rigid with indignant surprise when we inform them that the ancient font of this ancient church lies now crumbling to pieces in the churchyard, whither it was unceremoniously thrust by the wardens in order to make room for a pew! It is a melancholy fact that, though ancient fonts are not rare, there is scarcely a church which retains its own: a basin is thought good enough for the first solemn rite of Christianity; and for the last twenty years the churches, generally, have had no vessel more dignified or decent. The old fonts are, for the most part, *very* old, and not more old than simple, being formed of one square and almost solid block of granite, with little or no ornament. In the latter respect they differ from the ancient Runic monuments, which are covered with inscriptions. These have been often considered of such intense difficulty as to defy interpretation. However this may be in Scotland, it is not so in Man. The most approved translations are diametrically opposed in sense, the fact appearing to be that each reader translates for himself, and everybody is amiable enough to approve of the translation. The puzzled

antiquaries, in short, "*traduce*" them as they please and nobody objects.

There was no lack of majesty in the state maintained here, by some of the servants of the Romish Church, when that Church was in its high and palmy days. Thus the prioress of Douglas flaunted it like a queen: she presided at her own baronial courts: exercised temporal as well as spiritual discipline; and could absolve a thief as well as hang him, provided only that he was one of her own vassals. The house itself was founded by that indefatigable Irish lady, the almost ubiquitous St. Bridget. It dated from the sixth century, and was for monks as well as nuns; the gentlemen, no doubt, exceeding even the lady recluses in the attention paid to the dame superior. Bridget and her happy family, and all succeeding prioresses who undertook to govern the cowl as well as the kirtle, had, no doubt, an enviable time of it.

The abbey of Rushen is redolent of less brilliant living glories, but it is proud of its dead possessions even now. It is the resting-place of some of the once mightiest in the isle, and he who treads the hallowed ground walks in the dust of barbaric kings, princely bishops, baronial abbots, and of a host of men who died in an odour of sanctity which, according to our Tractarian brethren, is still as a sweet savour in the nostrils of enquiring travellers. The abbey was always royal, for it was founded in the twelfth century by the good King Olave, who enriched the Manx Church generally by endowing it with both estates and revenues, and he privileged it with the exercise of many great liberties. He was not only liberal, but his liberality was spiced with wisdom. That this is certain may be seen in his apportionment of the revenues bestowed upon the Church, part absolutely and part in trust. He awarded one-third to the bishop for his fitting maintenance—one-third to his favourite abbey to be appropriated to educational and charitable purposes—and the remaining third to the parochial priests for their subsistence. The abbey was a Cistercian cell, dependent on the abbey of Furness, in the chapter of which long resided the power of nominating to the bishopric of Man. The abbey of Rushen, though founded by a king, was of unpretending simplicity in its architecture; and the brethren who served it, or who dwelt under its shadow, are said to have been as plain and simple in their characters, and honest to boot. The abbey church of Rushen always reminds us of old St. Pancras, London, not in aspect but in fortunes. Old St. Pancras was the last church in England in which mass was celebrated previous to the Reformation; and English Papists to this day desire to leep within its consecrated soil, because *eau-benite* has fallen

upon it from a French priest's *goupillon.* So, the abbey of Rushen was the last ecclesiastical edifice in the isle and kingdom of Man in which the Romish service was performed ere the State ceased to be Roman. Henry VIII. spared the monastery, until every other in England had been dissolved, with confiscation of effects. It was the last monastery destroyed by his orders. That of Reading had succumbed, and Rushen closed the dreary record.*

"What has become of the endowments?.....The Lord of the Isle seized upon the third, which had been held in trust by the monks *pro bono publico.* When Bishop Barrow came to the see, in 1663, he found those vicars, the tithes of whose parishes were in the hands of the lord, in the greatest destitution; and, devoting all his energies to raise them from this state, he found means to purchase a long lease of those impropriations from the then lord, Charles, Earl of Derby. An estate of the earl's in England—viz., the Manor of Bispham, together with the farm or tenement called "Mithop"—was collaterally bound for the payment of the clergy. On the alienation of the island from the duke's family, the Duke of Atholl claimed the impropriations as an inseparable appendage of his estate and royalty, of which it could not be divested by any right that had or could be shown. The clergy were thus thrown on the collateral security—viz., the estate of the Earl of Derby. The deeds, for some time, could not be found, and the clergy were under the most painful apprehension, and would gladly have taken any reasonable consideration rather than lose all. At last, through the exertions of Bishop Wilson and his son, they were discovered in the Rolls-office, and the claim of the clergy was established. The compensation then agreed on to be paid out of the Derby estate was 219*l.* per annum; but, in 1809, Bishop Cregan demanded a revisal, on the ground that the Earl of Derby had granted to Bishop Barrow all tenths yearly renewing, growing, and increasing, and that the said tenths had greatly increased since 1735, when the former compensation was agreed on, and it was found that their real net annual value was 663*l.* Lord Derby hereupon agreed to pay down the sum of 16,000*l.* to be rid of the annual charge on his estate altogether, and very unwisely the sum was accepted, and spent in bad purchases of land returning only about 400*l.* per annum. Before the sale of his rights to the English Crown in 1765, under the Act called the 'Act of Revestment,' the Duke of Atholl had sold half of the impropriations to different parties: the other half is now in the hands of the British Government, and amounts to above 525*l.* per annum. It thus appears that, of more than 1,000*l.* per annum (the present value of the third of the tithe belonging anciently to the abbey of Rushen for the purposes of education and relief of the poor), none is applied

* If we recollect rightly, it is stated in Dr. Doran's "History and Antiquities of the Town and Borough of Reading, in Berkshire," that the Benedictine monastery in that town was the last which suffered in the visitation of dissolution that swept the religious houses in England.

to its ancient use: it is alienated from the Church—the 400*l.* per annum applied to the augmentation of the salaries of the poorer clergy being, in reality, the proceeds of a certain claim upon an English nobleman's estate, obtained of his ancestors with the money collected by the pious Bishop Barrow in 1666."

In noticing the "dust of the mighty dead" which rests within the ancient walls of the abbey of Rushen, the author mentions, among many others, the following:—Magnus, the last king of the Norwegian line, *died* in 1237, and was also interred in the abbey of Rushen; and in an explanatory foot-note attached to this we are told that Magnus III., son of Olave Godredson, was chosen king by the universal consent of his people in 1252 (fifteen years after his death!), was confirmed in Norway 1254, and by Henry III. of England in 1256. He assisted Richard, Bishop of the Isles, in the consecration of the abbey church of St. Mary of Rushen, which had been begun one hundred and thirty years before. He was the ninth and last of the race of Goddard Cronan, and left no child; so that, if he really died in the year stated by Mr. Cumming, he must have displayed an unwonted activity after his decease. The fact is, that the above is a specimen of negligence with regard to dates which pervades the book, and which we hope to see corrected in a second edition. Old Peter Heylin—that chorographic doctor who wrote a topographical description of the whole world and lost his way in his own wood—says that Magnus was, not the ninth but, the fourteenth king of the Norwegian race, and he places the year of his deceased in 1266.

We must not leave Rushen without intimating that the saint from whom the locality is named was one of the twelve missionary fathers who, with Columba, settled in Iona, in 563. The castle of Rushen is one of the last places in which spirits have loved to linger. The apparition of a woman who had been executed for the murder of her child long chose to walk its dreary passages to the affright of nervous debtors and the surprise of doughty soldiers. To this day the unhappy ghost is said occasionally to appear to such as have very strong eye-sight, very weak nerves, and a profound belief that, in spite of civilization and Mr. Dickens's hint to free-minded wandering ghosts to leave their old damp abodes and settle in pleasant places, spectres do not decline to walk. We will add, for our own parts, that *revenans* at Rushen are as rare as sepulchral brasses throughout the island. Brasses and turnpikes are things not known in Man. Those who are in search of the former need not cross to the island, except that they will find better amusement or instruction in a study of such of the Runic manuments as are legible and intelligible. The inscriptions on

these generally commemorate some professing Christians of old: the modern epitaphs, we are informed, would scarcely lead any reader to suppose that they recorded the demise of men who lived and died in Christ.

The memories of Rushen are holy memories; but, perhaps, they are less so than those bequeathed by St. Maughold. Maughold parish, for instance, is invested with higher sanctity than other parishes in Manx districts. The saint from whom such privilege was derived was a converted Irish thief, and, like most gentlemen of his profession, he enjoyed a hundred aliasses. Bad as he was, St. Patrick converted him. It was hard, indeed, if the saint who could banish everything poisonous out of Ireland had failed in cleansing the heart of a simple-minded freebooter like Maughold, *alias* Marcutius, &c.: he converted him, on the contrary, with ease. The neophyte no sooner felt himself a Christian than he abandoned all his old wicked companions, flung himself into a cockboat, and, delivering himself to the mercy of the waves, heeded not whither he was tending until his frail vessel bumped hard against that promontory of Man known as St. Maughold's Head: he rose, walked on shore, and founded a religious house. The discipline of this house was so severe that the active and ubiquitous Bridget, of whom we have already spoken and for whom nothing could be too unpleasant, made a rough passage from Ireland expressly that she might receive from the hands of the ex-Irish robber the much-coveted veil of virginity. The desire of the nun was fulfilled; and, after she had left the island, St. Maughold proceeded to divide it into the seventeen parishes of which its ecclesiastical division at present consists. His memory is still cherished, and deservedly cherished, by numbers of the simple inhabitants, who, on the first Sunday in August, annually repair to the spring which served for the saint's first baptismal font whereat he performed the sacred rite, and take of its water home again wherewith to cure a thousand sorry ills that flesh is heir to, and keep off a thousand shadowy perils which, if they threaten, never come.

We have previously alluded to the period when the sovereignty of Man and the Isles ceased to be vested in one single person. This separation of ancient dignity and power caused some vexation to the Hibernian saint, although he had long ceased to be in the flesh, as thus:—

"Somerled, Earl of Argyle, had taken up arms against Olave Godredson. A sea battle was fought between them on the eve of the Epiphany with such doubtful success to either that the next morning they came to a compromise to divide between them the sovereignty of the isles: under this promise, Somerled acquired all the isles,

excepting Man, south of the Ardnamurchan. From that period the sovereignty of the isles ceased to be vested in one single person.

"In the year 1158, Somerled again, with a fleet of fifty-three ships, came to Man, where, encountering Godred, he defeated that prince, who then fled to the coast of Norway to crave assistance.

"On the approach of Somerled to the isle the second time, the Manx people conveyed their money and valuables to the sanctuary of St. Maughold's Church, in hopes (says the chronicler) that the veneration due to Machutus, added to the sanctity of the place, would secure everything within its precincts. After the battle, in which he was victorious, the fleet of Somerled lay at Ramsay, and one of his captains, Gil Colum, made a proposal to surprise the church of St. Maughold, and, at least, drive off the cattle that were feeding round the churchyard. With much reluctance Somerled consented, pronouncing, at the same time, these words—'Let the affair rest between thee and St. Machutus: let me and my troops be innocent: we claim no share in thy sacrilegious booty." Gil Colum laid his plans accordingly, arranging with his three sons to effect the surprise at daybreak the following morning; but, as he lay asleep in his tent at dead of night, St. Machutus appeared to him arrayed in white linen, and holding a pastoral staff in his hand, with which he thrice struck him in the heart: awaking in great terror of mind, he sent for the priests of the church to receive his confession, but they had no words of comfort for the dying wretch: one of them even proceeded to pray that St. Machutus would never withdraw his hand till he had made an end of the impious man, and immediately he was attacked by a swarm of monstrous filthy flies, and, about six in the morning, expired in great misery and torture. Somerled and his whole troop were struck with such dismay upon the death of this man that, as soon as the tide floated their ships, they weighed anchor and, with precipitancy, returned home."

In spite of the merits and legends attached to the freebooter-saint, with as many appellations as the peacock's tail has eyes, he is not after all the true and original saint who converted the island from Druidism, and even less enlightened superstitious, to the divine revelations and reasonable teachings of Christianity. St. Maughold did much in his capacity as a Romish saint; but the fathers of the British Church had long before spread the good seed and reaped no indifferent harvest. St. Patrick was the first who reared the cross in Man; and when his great and holy vocation called him to other scenes, and he was compelled to leave the island, in the year 447, he left behind him a most capable substitute, Germanus, with the briefest, completest, and most intelligible of instructions—viz., "Ad regendum et erudiendum populum in fide Christi." This was upwards of a century previous to the first Romish mission sent hither under Augustine, and it was not far short of three quarters of a century prior to the foundation of the see of Bangor. The cathedral of Germanus, standing on the south-eastern side of the

Island, is a memento and record of the earlier mission. The traveller who stands there has beneath him and around him the vestiges of the cathedral church of the most ancient existing see of the British isles. When St. Patrick left Germanus, we may call it, enthroned therein, he was on his way to Ireland to found the see of Armagh, the most ancient in that unhappy locality, but of less ancient date than that of St. Germanus in Man. Of the *original* cathedral in Man no trace is supposed to have survived the storms of heaven, the violence of man, and the silent but consuming course of all-devouring time. The building, of which the ruins are now beheld by the traveller, was begun by Bishop Simon, who was consecrated Bishop of Sodor in 1226: his work is positively pointed out in the chancel, the style of which is early English, "with somewhat of an admixture of Norman character." It corresponds, we are told, in the main, with the architecture of the cathedral church at Drontheim; and, as Mr. Cumming remarks, it is interesting on account of the known connection of this see of Man and the Isles with that archiepiscopate, the Bishops of Sodor and Man having obtained their consecration from the Archbishop of Drontheim for many generations.

For the architectural details of this ancient cathedral we must refer our readers to Mr. Cumming's pages. Here we must confine ourselves to stating that the central tower and north and south transepts are battlemented, and that, in fact, whatever may have been intended by the founder, Bishop Simon, who built the chancel, it has been made to answer the purposes of cathedral, fortress, and state-prison. Among the prisoners who have languished in captivity in the crypt, and existed there upon the reminiscences of liberty, was Dame Eleanor Cobham, that magic-working wife of the hospitable Duke Humphrey with whom so many poor and proud Londoners were wont to dine in Paul's-walk. The duchess was arrested with Roger Bolyngbroke, a reputed necromancer; and Margery Jourdemain, known as the Witch of Eye. The latter two were accused of having yielded to the subornation and bribery of the duchess, and having devised an image of wax like unto the king (Henry VI.), the which image (says Falgan, in his "Chronicle"), "they dealt so with, that, by their devilish sorcery, they intended to bring the king out of life, for the which reason they were adjudged to die." The duchess—that "ill-natur'd Eleanor" who would ever

> "——— still be hammering treachery
> To tumble down her husband and herself,
> From top of honour to disgrace's feet"—

terminated her somewhat intriguing career at Peel, and the crypt beneath the chancel of the cathedral of Germanus is pointed out as her prison-house. "They tell you (says the marvel-loving Waldon), that ever since her death, to this hour, a person is heard to go up and down the stone staircase of one of these little houses on the walls constantly every night as soon as the clock strikes twelve. The conjecture is that it is the troubled spirit of this lady, who died as she lived, dissatisfied and mourning her fate." In later years, more ignoble captives endured there the penalties of their offence. We are told that, even down to the episcopate of Bishop Wilson, the crypt of the cathedral seems to have been used as the place of confinement for persons guilty of offences coming under ecclesiastical censure—such as incest and adultery.

From the period of Germanus, in 447, to that of the Rev. Robert Eden, D.D., in 1847—a period of exactly fourteen centuries—the Church in Man has been presided over by seventy bishops, giving an average of just twenty years as the duration of each episcopal reign. The last five bishops, however, together occupy but a space of nine years; and in 1847 two bishops were in succession spiritual lords of the Church in Man. The exact legal title is somewhat curious: it runs thus:—"Bishop of Man, of Sodor, of Sodor and Man, and of Sodor of Man." The origin of the term "Sodor" is considered indicative of the various ecclesiastical changes in the extent of the diocese at different periods. The confirmation of the respective bishops has been performed at the hands of various primates: originally it was with the Archbishop of Drontheim, who was called "Nidorensis Episcopus," and who was metropolitan. The Bishops of Sodor, or of the Isles, were consecrated by the Archbishops of Glasgow. The Archbishops of Armagh, too, appear to have exercised the right of consecrating the Manx bishops during a short period. After alternating between Canterbury and York, the consecration finally rested in the primate of the last-named city. Originally, the diocese was restricted to the Isle of Man; and it was not for nearly four centuries after its creation that the bishopric of Sodor and the Western Isles (Hebrides) was instituted by Pope Gregory IV.—the name Sodor, says Bishop Wilson, being taken from the cathedral church in Iona, dedicated to our Saviour, in Greek Σωτήρ (Soter). Mr. Cumming remarks upon this derivation, that it is at the same time worthy of notice that the thirty islands constituting this bishopric of the isles were generally named the Sudereys or Southerly Islands, in distinction to the northern group called the "Norderays;" and as the terms "Bishop of

the Sodor" and "Bishop of the Isles" are often found convertible in the old chronicles, we are very much inclined to accept Mr. Cumming's etymology in preference to that of Dr. Wilson. The bishoprics of Sodor and Man were not united until the year 1098 by Magnus of Norway, the conqueror of Man and of the Western Isles. The union continued about three centuries, when the English, having got possession of the island on the death of John Dunkan, a native Manxman and the thirty-fifth bishop, the clergy of Iona and the isles elected for their bishop a person named John, while the clergy of Man chose for their prelate Robert Waldby, who presided over the see above twenty years, and then left it on his appointment to the archiepiscopal see of Dublin.

With the loss of the bishopric of the isles, the Manx prelates refused to lose their titles too: they clung to the appellative of Bishops of Sodor as the monarchs of England clung to the title of "King of France" long after they even assumed a right to wear it. They created, in fact, a new Sodor, giving that name to a little island near Peel, in which the cathedral of St. Germanus was built, and which had been previously known as the "Isle of St. Patrick." On the other hand, the Scottish bishops, after the separation of the sees, abandoned the ancient title of Bishops of Sodor, and simply called themselves "Bishops of the Isles." In speaking of the progress of Christianity among the Manx of earlier days, Mr. Cumming says:—

"There is no distinct evidence of Christianity having made any progress in the Isle of Man till the middle of the fifth century. Hector Boetius has made a statement, which has been followed by Bishop Spotswood and Buchanan, that 'Cratilinth, the Scottish king, A. D. 247, was very earnest in the overthrow of Druidism in the Isle of Man and elsewhere; and upon the occasion of Dioclesian's persecution, when many Christians fled to him for refuge, he gave them the Isle of Man for their residence, and erected there for them a stately temple, which he called 'Sudorense Fanum.' And herein Amphibabas, a Briton, sat first bishop.' The story, however, has been rejected by most authors of good repute, and put on the same footing as that of Copgrave, in his 'Life of Joseph of Arimathea,' respecting Mordraius, the Manx king, said to have been converted to Christianity. Sacheverell justly observes that it is almost impossible that the Manx nation should preserve no memory of so considerable a blessing as their first conversion to Christianity: but their tradition is directly against the story.

"The mission of St. Patrick and his twenty coadjutors to Ireland for the suppression of the Pelagian heresy, A. D. 434, is well known. He returned into Britain for the purpose of obtaining more help, and, in company with thirty religious persons, whilst making a second

voyage to Ireland, was driven by a storm to the Isle of Man, A. D. 444, Here finding the people much given to magic, under the influence of Mananan-beg-mac-y-Sheive, he stayed three years, and was instrumental in their conversion to the pure Christian faith."

St. Patrick left Germanus to rule over the infant Church in Man. The latter is described as having so successfully settled the matter of religion there that the island never after relapsed. Of the two succeeding bishops little is known and less told. The fourth bishop was that Maughold, who was flung ashore in a hurricane, as we have already stated, and who was elected bishop forthwith by the universal consent of the Manx Church. The fifth bishop was a somewhat apocryphal nephew of St. Patrick: of him and of his two successors we have very little information. In the year 600 we find Conanus, the eighth bishop. He was tutor to the three sons of the fourth king of Scotland, and at this period the Isle of Man enjoyed such a reputation for its learning and learned men that it was considered as the favourite dwelling-place of the Muses; and a Scottish law was passed, in a spirit of humility which is unparralleled in Scottish annals, confessing that education for gentle youths was rather ignorantly conducted in Caledonia, and enacting that all heirs to the Scottish throne, and princes of the Scottish reigning family, should receive their education in Man and nowhere beside. With Conanus we complete the first two centuries, from the accession of Germanus. After him there is some very unsatisfactory confusion, out of which the only comfort to be derived is from the assurance given us in the "Chronicles" of the monks of Rushen, that "there was doubtless a true succession," and that the Church flourished under the guidance of the episcopal successors of the great missionary St. Patrick. "It is not at all improbable (says Mr. Cumming) that, during the period in which the authority of the Welch princes was acknowledged in the Isle of Mau, there might be a close connection between the Manx Church and the relic of the ancient British Church in Wales, which did not, until a very late period, acknowledge the authority of Rome, and hence the silence of the Rushen chroniclers." There is nothing further particularly worthy of remark in the list of bishops (excepting, perhaps, that the name of St. Brandon, or Braddon, is found on the roll), until we come to Wymund, son of Job, a Manxman. He was the sixteenth bishop, and the date of his consecration was A. D. 1100, the year in which Rufus perished by priestly hands in the New Forest. We are informed that he was consecrated by Thomas Turstan, Archbishop of York, and that he was probably the first Bishop of Man who was a suffragan of that

province. "He had previously been a monk of the abbey of Furness; but, after his elevation to the bishopric of Sodor and Man, he *married* a daughter of Somerled, Thane of Argyle, and becoming obnoxious, on account of his overbearing conduct, he was expelled the island and his eyes were put out." His marriage proves, at least, that he had payed no homage to the ruler who sat at Rome. By whom he was so cruelly punished, Mr. Cumming does not inform us. The nineteenth bishop was Reginald, a Norwegian: to him the thirds of all the livings in the island were granted by the clergy, in order that, from that time, they might be freed from all episcopal exactions for ever. The date of his consecration was 1181, and Mr. Cumming thinks that it was probable that he was the first bishop who was consecrated by the Archbishop of Drontheim. It is related of John, the twenty-fourth bishop, A.D. 1226, that he was burnt to death through the negligence of his servants "*apud Jervaus in Anglid*," or, Jervaux Abbey in Yorkshire. Lawrence, the twenty-sixth bishop, A.D. 1247, also met with as sudden and violent an end, though by different means. He was drowned with Harold, the King of Man, his queen, and almost all the nobility of the island. He had been archdeacon of the island, and his election to the episcopacy had not been effected without great dispute and opposition. We know not whether the Bishop of Rome took advantage of the dissensions which reigned, and by interference secured power for himself; but certain it is that the next bishop, Richard, an Englishman, A.D. 1252, was the first Bishop of Man who was consecrated at Rome. The consecration was still given by the Archbishop of Drontheim; but the performance of this ceremony in the Papal presence would seem to intimate that surrender was made by the Church of Man of its liberties, and that henceforward Romish sanction was necessary to the making of its bishops. Misfortunes characterised the episcopate of Richard, and his reign is distinguished in a melancholy sense by the conquest of the island by the Scots. At his death the foreign conqueror appears to have claimed the right, and to have exercised the privilege, of nominating the successor to the bishopric. This was Mark of Galloway; and it is because he was the nominee of a crown which had no shadow of right to nominate, that he was driven from the island by the Manxmen. The Pope stood by the Scottish king and his bishop, and placed the island under an interdict, which heavy oppression was not raised until the defeated Manxmen consented to recall their bishop: even, then ultimate forgiveness was purchased, and, by way of commutation for the supposed wrong inflicted on Markus Gallo-

vadinus, every house in the island had a tax laid upon its chimney and contributed a "Smoke Penny" to the Pope. He was not an inactive prelate; and, during his presidency over the Manx see, he held a synod at Kirk Braddon, A.D., 1291, in which thirty-five canons were enacted for the rule and guidance of the Church in Man. Seven years later he died blind, and his body was interred in the cathedral of St. Germanus. To every traveller entering on the precincts of that ancient church it may be said, "Tread lightly!—this is hallowed ground." Of his successor, Onanus, the name alone is recorded: of his five years' episcopal rule not a vestige or a remembrance remains. Little more is known of the next bishop, Mauritius, who succeeded in 1303: indeed, it is doubted whether he ever was consecrated, and his right to be placed in the roll of bishops at all is much questioned: he was sent prisoner to London by Edward I.—wherefore does not appear; but it is certain that the Manx clergy looked upon him as defunct or incompetent; for, during his lifetime and while he was in captivity, they elected, or received the royal nomination from Scotland of, Allan of Galloway, otherwise Allan of Wigtown, A.D. 1305, who governed the Church with honour and integrity. The succeeding three bishops were all Scotsmen, and have left little worthy of record: the last of the three alone, Thomas (A.D. 1434), is remarkable, and that in not the most laudable way: he was the thirty-fourth bishop of the see of Man, and was the first island prelate that exacted twenty shillings (well worth twenty pounds sterling now) of his clergy by way of procuration; and he likewise compelled all aliens to pay the tenths. William Russell, the succeeding and thirty-fifth bishop, is distinguished for having disregarded altogether the authority of the Archbishop of Drontheim, by whom his predecessors had for so many years been consecrated. At the period of his election, in 1348, he was Abbot of Rushen, and he was elected unanimously by the whole clergy of Man, assembled in St. German's Church, in Peel Castle: the election was confirmed by Pope Clement VI., then holding his diminished state at Avignon, by whom also he was consecrated. At a synod held in the kirk of St. Michael, in 1350, he added five canons to those formerly enacted for the discipline of the Church in Man. The thirty-sixth bishop, John Dunkan, who was, like Russell, elected by the entire clergy of the island, proceeded to Avignon to receive consecration from Pope Gregory XI. The rite, however, was administered to him "per Cardinalum Prenistinum, dudum Archiepiscopum." His installation was delayed for two years (until 1371), in consequence of an accident or event that befell him on his

way home: he was made prisoner at Boulogne, in Picardy. England was then at disastrous war with France. In the year 1374, the year of Dunkan's captivity, she retained of her transmarine possessions only Calais, Bordeaux, Bayonne, and a few places on the Dordogne. Edward III. never possessed Boulogne: it was taken by Henry VIII. and never recaptured, having been *sold* by him to the French for a few thousand crowns.

As Dunkan could not purchase liberty at a lower rate, he was at length compelled to ransom himself for the sum of five hundred marks. It was no great compliment to his dignity or person that either was so lightly esteemed. He died in the year 1380; and that year is worthy of being remembered, as it is the period when the two sees of Man and the Isles were finally and for ever divided. From that time the clergy of Iona elected their own bishop for the Western Islands; and the clergy of Man now chose for their own particular pastor and spiritual father, Robert Welby, or Waldby, of whom we only know that he kept the island episcopal throne during two-and-twenty years, and then surrendered it, as is believed, for the place, dignity, and responsibilities of Archbishop of Dublin. Nothing calling for particular note occurs until we reach the fortieth bishop. His name was the emphatically Saxon one of John Green: he was elected in 1448, and he was not only vicar of Dunchurch, in Warwickshire, at the time of his election, but he continued so till his death, having held his English preferment with his Manx bishopric. He served in Warwick and he ruled in Man. The forty-third bishop was Hugh or Evan (Huan, John) Hesketh: he succeeded in 1487. In his time, Thomas Stanley, Earl of Derby and King of Man, confirmed to Hesketh and his successors all the lands and possessions of his bishopric. The confirmation was made by deed, dated March 28th, 1505, and a copy of the deed may be consulted by the curious reader at the seventh page of the first volume of the "Monasticon Anglicanum." Family influences and private patronage begin to be visible when we come to the forty-fifth prelate. In the year 1542, we find Thomas Stanley, son of Sir Edward Stanley, the first Lord Monteagle—(the last ancient title has been adopted by Spring Rice, wherefore we know not, he having as little in him of the old blood of the old Stanleys as Mr. Coke, Earl of Leicester, had of that of the Dudleys, or as the Duke of Northumberland, the worthy great-grandson of a worthy old Yorkshire landholder, named Hugh Smithson, has of that of the Percys)—we find, we say, that in the year 1542 the above-mentioned Thomas Stanley held the bishopric. How he obtained it we

are not told, nor is it of much importance to ascertain. The great historical event that affected his see, during his occupation of it, was its severance from the province of Canterbury and its annexation to that of York. This was effected by the famous thirty-third statute of Henry VIII. Stanley had the hot blood in him which boils in the veins of his namesake rather than descendant of our own days. He set Henry's decree at defiance and kept his head!—he, however, lost his see. His contumacy purchased for him deprivation, and Cranmer's old chaplain, Ferrier, who was afterwards translated to St. David's, was appointed Bishop of Man. Good old Ferrier shared some of his master's sentiments and endured his master's fate: he appears to have displeased more than one party in power. He was imprisoned during the reign of Edward VI. for his Lutheran opinions, and on Mary's accession to the crown he was condemned as a heretic, degraded, and executed by fire at the Market Cross of Caermarthen, March 30, 1555, the year famous for the attempts made to raise Cardinal Pole to the papacy. During the remainder of the reign of Mary, the see of Sodor and Man was occupied by Doctor Henry Mann, Dean of Chester. His grave, if not his monument, may yet be seen in the church of St. Andrew Undershaft, Leadenhall-street.* On his death, A.D. 1556, Thomas Stanley was restored; nor was he again deprived on the accession of Elizabeth, but continued tranquilly to exercise his episcopal functions till his death in 1568. In recording the restoration of this bishop, Mr. Cumming quotes from Ward's "Ancient Records," wherein, touching the renewed episcopacy of Stanley, it is said:—"Thus it appears that the see of Sodor and Man has never lost the regular succession of its bishops, being the only diocese in the British Church of which that can be said." Mr. Cumming adds to this, and we read it with surprise, that "there is on the Isle of Man no record whatever of the period of the Reformation." Stanley was succeeded, A.D. 1574, by John Salisbury, Archdeacon of Anglesea, who had a share in translating the Bible into Welsh. He died in 1573. "After the not unusual custom of Elizabeth (says Mr. Cumming), the see was kept vacant three years, when John Merrick, A.D. 1577, *was sworn* bishop of the isle. He gave Camden the 'History of the Isle of Man,' published in his 'Britannia.'"

* This church derives its name of Undershaft on account of a May-pole or shaft having been formerly raised close to it every year, on May-day, which was higher than the church steeple. The people finally destroyed the pole under the persuasion of a reforming priest named Sir Simon, who used to preach from an elm tree in St. Paul's Churchyard, sing high-mass in English from the top of a tomb-stone, and who told the people that the May-pole was an idol and must be burnt.

The fifty-first bishop, John Phillips, who was consecrated in 1605, was a native of North Wales, and was the author of a translation of the Bible and Prayer-book into Manx. He was famous for three things besides his learning and industry—namely, for his great pains in preaching, his charity, and his hospitality. The last who sat bishop before the civil wars was Doctor Richard Parr (A.D. 1635), who was famous as an university preacher at Oxford before he was elected to the prelacy. The see, of course, was vacant during the Puritan rule. It continued without a bishop for the space of seventeen years; but not without a wise monitor, friend, and father, in the person of Archdeacon Rutter, whose virtues were not rewarded but acknowledged by his nomination to the ancient bishopric. Mr. Cumming describes him as "a man of exemplary goodness and moderation." Seacome says of him—"To his assistance I am greatly obliged for his collections and memoirs, made use of in my present history of the noble house of Stanley, but especially in that ever-memorable siege of Lathom, the defence whereof he had a large share in." In Peck's "Desiderata Curiosa" there is a copy of a letter addressed by the great Earl of Derby, who perished at Bolton, to his son Charles. It was written in 1648, during the writer's sojourn at Castle Rushen. From it Mr. Cumming quotes these two clauses as in connection with the founding of King William College, the origin of which, as he justly says, there is good reason for tracing up to the great and unfortunate earl. The clauses in the letter alluded to run thus:—"Fear God: honour the King. Have this in your thoughts—first to choose a reverend and holy man to your bishop:" and, "I had a design, and God may enable me to set up an university without much charge (as I have conceived it), which may much oblige the nations round about us. It may get friends unto the country and enrich this land. This certainly would please God and man." The troublous times in which the great earl lived and died are noticed by Mr. Cumming as sufficiently accounting for the non-fulfilment of Lord Derby's designs and wishes. The college was not established. Nearly two centuries were added to the heavy record of time before that realization of an honourable intention was effected. The son of the martyr for royalty, however, was not forgetful of his duty, and he manifested this in the choice made by him of Archdeacon Rutter for a bishop. The latter had been archdeacon for many years when, in 1661, he was appointed to the bishopric. He was a man "for whom (said the earl to his son) you and I may both thank God." Mr. Cumming says that he was removed by death in the brief space of two years after his consecration. He composed his own

epitaph, and in the authorship has displayed a quaintness and a truth that deserve to be recorded. The epitaph, which we give below, was placed on his tomb in Peel Cathedral, incribed on a brass plate. Half a century ago the plate, no one knows why, "was *removed*" from the tomb, and it was supposed to be lost or destroyed. The word *removed* is, of course, an euphuism for *stolen*, and reminds us of a passage in the ancient comedy of "The Puritan; or, the Widow of Watling-street," as thus:—

"*Nicholas.* Steal my master's chain? quoth he. No: it shall ne'er be said that Nicholas St. Antlings committed bird-lime! Had it been to rob (or remove) I would ha' don't, but I must not steal: that's the word—the literal, thou shalt not steal: and would you wish me to steal them?

"*Pye.* No faith, that were too much, to speak truth! Why, wilt thou nim it from him?

"*Nich. That* I will!"

Like the long-lost figure of the Virgin of Boulogne, however, the plate was found by a lucky individual in the dwelling-place (proverbially constructed) of Truth—the well was near the sally-port of Peel Castle. The plate, which was discovered in it in the year 1844, was thus inscribed:

"In hac domo quam a vermiculis
Accepi confratribus meis spe
Resurrectionis ad vitam
Jaceo Sam permissione divinæ
Episcopus hujus insulæ.
Siste, Lector)=(vide ac ride
Palatium Episcopi.
Obiit xxx° die mensis Maii 1663."

In place of the author of this quaint and suggestive epitaph was instituted the brother of King Charles's mercer and linen-draper, Dr. Isaac Barrow, uncle to the famous (yet hardly most deservedly famous) Dr. Isaac Barrow, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. When Dr. Barrow was appointed bishop, he was also nominated governor of the isle. In him Church and State, in their fitting union, were most fittingly represented. "In this joint office as sword-bishop or governor, both in civil and ecclesiastical state, he conferred in the short period of his stay most important and lasting benefits upon this Church and people." Mr. Cumming is of opinion that *all* the learning of the clergy of Man is greatly owing to his industry. If Bishop Barrow have but just claim to only half of this eulogy, it will still be sufficient praise. Whatever acknowledgment the Manx clergy may be indebted to him for their learning, it is certain

that many of the poorer clergy of the island owe to his prudence and energy the bread they eat. It is to him, too, that is owing the arrangement by which all Manx clerical students, who have been educated at Oxford—we presume on Manx foundations, if any such there be—are obliged, if required, after ordination, to exercise their sacred ministry within the island. There are cases in which this might be attended with evils. There is, we think, a scholarship also at Oxford, and he who has ever enjoyed it can, when in orders, be compelled to proceed to the colonies, and even be required, under certain penalties, to proceed as a missionary to certain heathen nations. It is not long since the Bishop of London required the fulfilment of the stipulatious annexed to the scholarship in the case of a reverend gentleman who had just succeeded to some preferment. The peremptory demand was resisted on the plea that such fulfilment had not been demanded for centuries. How the vexed question was decided, or if it even *be* yet decided, we confess our inability to assert. We only know that, if there be any error in our details, we are correct in the substance. Bishop Lake, who was the fifty-seventh bishop, is better known as that Dr. Lake, Bishop of Chichester, who was, in June of the eventful year of 1688—that year and the Protestant hero of it so hateful to the memories of our Tractarian friends, in glorious company with Sancroft, Lloyd, Ken, Turner, White, and Trelawney—committed to the Tower by James II. for petitioning him against the publication of his "Declaration for Liberty of Conscience"—a declaration that was designed to strangle the liberty of every man who *had* a conscience. Dr. Baptist Levinz succeeded Lake in the island see, when the latter was translated to Bristol, previous to his second translation to Chichester; and then we find the *semper venerabile nomen* of Thomas Wilson. We shall have recourse to Mr. Cumming, or to the authorities which he himself quotes, for what we have to convey to our readers of a man so well known, whose praise is in all the Church, and of the record of whose various and always praiseworthy deeds we are never weary of hearing:—

"Thomas Wilson was born at Burton, in Cheshire, on the 20th December, 1663, of honest parents, fearing God (as he himself says). His father, who died in 1702, was descended from a family which, from time immemorial, had lived in that neighbourhood: his mother was sister to Dr. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester."

He was educated at Chester, and entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1680: his design was to study medicine; but the true bent of his mind was not only noticed by his friend, Arch-

deacon Hewetson, but directed by that pious dignitary. He trained it towards the ever-living fountain from which Wilson, having once tasted, never ceased to drink. He consequently entered on the study of divinity, and he was ordained deacon on St. Peter's-day, 1686, worthily celebrating the day by offering a silver paten for the service of the holy table in the newly-consecrated Church of Kildare, the hands of whose bishop had been spread that day in blessing on his own head in ministerial ordination. At the close of the year 1686, he was licensed to a curacy in the parish of Winwick, Lancashire: his rector was Dr. Sherlock, his maternal uncle, and his services were rewarded by the munificent annual stipend of 30*l.* In 1689, he was ordained priest: three years after he became chaplain to the Earl of Derby, and tutor to his son, Lord Strange. We return to the pages of Mr. Cumming:—

"Mr. Wilson took great pains with his noble pupil, whose principal faults were want of consideration and a precipitancy of temper. The following extraordinary instance of his management on a particular occasion is a proof at once of his upright character and faithfulness. One day, as Lord Strange was going to set his name to a paper which he had not read, Mr. Wilson dropped some burning sealing-wax on his finger: the sudden pain made him very angry, but his tutor soon pacified him by observing that he did it to impress a lasting remembrance on his mind never to sign or seal any paper he had not first read and attentively examined."

The bishopric of Man was undoubtedly forced upon Earl Derby's chaplain, and that not without considerable trouble. On the 15th of January, 1697-8, he was created D.C.L. by the Archbishop of Canterbury, confirmed at Bow Church, and consecrated at the Savoy. His bishopric was worth 300*l.* per annum, and there was nothing of a palace remaining, save an old chapel and tower; yet, he not only had wherewithal, but to spare. By economy, by saving, and *by never enjoying what he could not pay for*—a golden rule—he effected wonders: and yet we will not say wonders, for the results were natural effects springing from most simple causes. The consequences could not have been other than what they were. If we all practised economy, saved what we could, and never possessed ourselves of anything for which we could not make immediate payment—payment that should not trench upon our next year's income—the world would be a paradise, and widows with destitute families would not be left to the charity of the public to make provision for them. Just observe what Dr. Wilson could do out of 300*l.* per annum: he built a new church, and by degrees spent 1,400*l.* in the improvement and better ordering of the episcopal demesne: in other words, he spent 1,400*l.* on labour! If you,

good reader, object to this, you do not know what it is to save 100*l.* per annum, and every year add the interest of it to the capital raised. Hard to save!—honest men, determined to do so (and in some instances it requires immense courage and some privations)—if they will but follow our suggestion—will find money something like the fabulous beanstalk, grow with magic rapidity and bear a crop a hundred fold for the first seed! Nor had Dr. Wilson much assistance—here fused it. The earl, knowing his condition and his good ambition, offered him the living of Baddesworth to hold *in commendam*, but he nobly declined taking it. He took in lieu a wife, who shared his love for that other wife of his, his diocese, and who made him the father of four children, of whom the youngest alone (Thomas) grew up to man's estate. Neither for especial purposes of the Church was he unmindful of duties to the poor:—

"Bishop Wilson's liberality was such that it was said, by a gentleman who knew him well, that 'he kept beggars from everybody's door but his own.' The following anecdote is to the same purport:—He had ordered a cloak to be made by his tailor, giving him directions that it should be quite plain, with merely a button and a loop to fasten it. 'But, my lord (said the tailor), what would become of the poor button-makers and their families if everyone thought in that way? They would be starved outright!' 'Do you say so, John (replied the good bishop)? Why, then, button it all over, John!'"

That he perfectly understood the meaning of *Episcopus*, and acted honestly and diligently up to that meaning, may be seen from the following:—

"He very frequently, on Sunday, rode out to distant parishes, without giving the clergy any warning, doing duty, and returning to Bishop's-court to dinner; and this even after he was eighty years of age, and on horseback. In his private diary we find, under date 1712, 'I supplied the vacant village of Kirk Arbory for one year, and applied the income towards building a new vicarage-house: with this and what I begged, and two pounds ten shillings I gave myself, and the assistance of the parish, we have erected one of the best houses in the diocese.'"

Again:—

"A doubt has sometimes been expressed as to whether the canons of the English Church, which received in the year 1603 the sanction of the clergy of the province of Canterbury, and were afterwards enjoined upon the whole Church by the king, are actually binding upon the clergy of the province of York, who did not assent to them. It is agreed that they are not binding upon the *laity* in either province, as they did not receive the sanction of Parliament. The Isle of Man is in the province of York, and the proctors for the clergy are summoned, with the rest of the bishops and clergy of that island, to con-

vocation. Now, as even the English Acts of Parliament do not apply to the Isle of Man—nor is the Act of Uniformity (as such) binding there, there being no record of its adoption by the insular legislation, and the approbation and signature of the lord of the isle—a still stronger doubt may be raised upon the question of the validity of the English canon law in this diocese. The Manx Church has always had its own peculiar and independent canon law, and has been governed by it; and, as respects the last, of those enacted drawn up by Bishop Wilson, there is no doubt of their being now binding equally upon clergy and laity. They are, in fact, statute law, having been passed in the Insular Convocation of Clergy and in the House of Keys, confirmed by the Earl of Derby, as Lord of the Isle, and published accordingly at the Tynwald-hill, June 6th, 1704."

Lord Chancellor King said of these "constitutions," as they are called, that "if the ancient discipline of the Church were lost, it might be found in all its purity in the Isle of Man." By the fifth canon it is enjoined that, if any one have incurred the censure of the Church, and after penance and reconciliation shall incur the same censure, he shall not be admitted to do penance again (as was formerly the custom), until the Church be fully satisfied by his repentant behaviour. If the offender could not procure a certificate from the minister, churchwardens, and some of the most respectable men of his parish, stating that they were convinced of his repentance, and this within three months of the commission of the offence, the Church inexorably proceeded to excommunication. In cases of scandal, too, it was made lawful that the objects of it might take oath that it was false; and it was enjoined that if, after such purgation and compurgation, the slander was revived, a heavy penalty was inflicted upon him who revived it and put it in circulation. The carrying of this law into effect brought the good bishop himself into captivity.

It appears that, in 1729, Mrs. Horne, the wife of the governor, circulated a charge not at all complimentary to the honour, virtue, and respectability of a widow lady named Puller, and a certain Sir James Pool. The consequence was that Archdeacon Horrobin refused to admit the lady to the sacrament of the Lord's supper. The slandered and innocent couple immediately had recourse to the remedy offered them by the Church. They took the oath before the bishop, and compurgators of the best character swore that, to the best of their belief, the report was utterly without foundation. As no evidence was produced on the other side to substantiate the report, the bishop cleared them of the charge, and sentenced Mrs. Horne to ask pardon of the parties she had traduced. But this lady treated Bishop, Church, and Government with alike pro-

found contempt, and she was consequently banished from the holy communion until she made atonement. She had a friend, however, in the archdeacon, who, in defiance of the censure, received her at the communion, and forthwith the bishop very properly inflicted on him a sentence of suspension.

"The archdeacon, instead of applying to his metropolitan, the Archbishop of York (the only legal judge to whom the appeal could be made), threw himself on the civil power, and the governor fined the bishop 50*l.*, and his two vicars-general, who had been officially concerned in the suspension, 20*l.* each. This fine they all refused to pay as arbitrary and unjust: on which the governor sent a party of soldiers, and they were, on the 29th of June, 1722, committed to the prison of Castle Rushen, where they were closely confined, and no person admitted within the walls to see or converse with them. The governor would not even permit the bishop's housekeeper, Mrs. Heywood, the daughter of a former governor, to see him, or any of his servants to attend him in his confinement. From the dampness of the prison the good bishop contracted a disorder in his right hand, which disabled him from the free use of his fingers, and he ever after wrote with his whole hand grasping the pen. He was confined in this prison for two months, but released at the end of that time by petition to the king; and on the 4th of July, 1724, the king in council reversed all the proceedings of the officers of the island, declaring them to be oppressive, arbitrary, and unjust. The expenses of his trial were very great, and it is said that, when all his lawyers' bills were paid, little indeed remained to him or his son. The king offered him the bishopric of Exeter to reimburse him, but he could not be prevailed on to quit his own diocese, nor would he prosecute the governor to recover damages, though urged so to do. He had established the discipline of the Church, and he sincerely and charitably forgave his persecutors. The concern of the people was so great, when they heard of his imprisonment, that they assembled in crowds, and it was with difficulty they were restrained from pulling down the governor's house, by the mild behaviour and persuasion of the bishop, who was permitted to speak to them only through a grated window or from the walls of the castle, whence he blessed and exhorted hundreds of them daily, telling them that he meant to appeal to Cæsar.....The attachment between the bishop and his flock was mutual, and so well known that, in the year 1735, when attending a levee of Queen Caroline where there were several prelates in attendance, she turned round and said, 'See here, my lords, is a bishop who does not come for a translation.' 'No, indeed, please your Majesty (replied the good bishop): I will not leave my wife in my old age because she is poor.' He had, before this, been offered English bishoprics by Queen Anne and George I."

He appears to have had an instinctive dread of the introduction into his diocese of novel practices by innovating clergymen of the English Church. When application was made to him to allow of the establishment of an afternoon lecture at Douglas,

the lecture to be delivered by a clergyman from England, he at once refused on the ground that such schemes would in a great measure set aside the express duties of catechizing bound upon the clergy by laws, rubrics, and canons; which duties, if fittingly performed, with seriousness and pains in explaining the several parts of the catechism, would, he thought, be of more use to the souls, both of the learned and ignorant, than the very best sermon out of the pulpit. He contended that such a course, after a serious, plain, and practical sermon in the morning "by a minister of Jesus Christ who preaches by his pious life and example," would answer all the ends of instruction without an afternoon sermon, "which (said the bishop to the applicant), being a novelty in this diocese, may be attended with unforeseen mischief, which you yourself may have reason to repent of, and the rest of your brethren have reason to blame you for, if I should be so weak as to comply with your inconsiderate project.

The good bishop held an opinion with respect to catechising which was stoutly maintained by Martin Luther. Public sermons—the great reformer was used to say—"Public sermons do very little to edify children, who observe and learn but little thereby. It is more needful that they be taught and well instructed with diligence in schools: and, at home, that they be orderly heard and examined in what they have learned. This way profiteth much: it is, indeed, very wearisome, but it is very necessary." "I would not (says Luther again) have preachers torment their hearers, and detain them with long and tedious preaching."

The lesson administered by the bishop has, however, been lost, and public catechising, we are told, except on particular occasions, has ceased in the diocese of Man. The endeavours of the present Bishop of St. Asaph, when Bishop of Man, by exhortation and example to restore it, met with but little encouragement and less success. Bishop Wilson firmly upheld the necessity of it up to the last year of his lengthened and useful life. Sensitively alive, however, as he was to any infringement upon the order and discipline of the Church, and upon the authority which he held as bishop, he was most liberal to all who were without the pale. His toleration was repaid with affection. Quakers loved and respected him. Papists attended his sermons and prayers, and Dissenters attended even the communion service. In the famine year of 1740 he distributed all his own corn to those who needed it; bought more at high prices; sold it again to the poor at a very low price; and succeeded, after some trouble, in obtaining an order of council, by which was taken off for a certain time the embargo that

had been levied upon all corn that had been imported into the Isle of Man. The fund established for the support of clergymen's widows was effected by him at the suggestion of his son. The annual interest in his day amounted only to 12*l.* per annum. Subsequently, the thirds of the living of Kirk Michael were, by purchase, applied to the uses of the charity; and now, from the commuted tithes of the island, 141*l.* per annum is paid as its equivalent. This commutation was effected in the year 1839, when the crown, bishop, and the clergy, agreed to commute the several tithes payable to them for the sum of 5,575*l.* per annum. Since the above named period, "the payments have been regulated according to the average prices of barley, wheat, and oats, during the seven years preceding each and every payment; and thereby the annual payments are liable to be increased or diminished accordingly. The proportions were regulated by Act of Tynwald. While talking of public Acts, we may here incidentally mention that the Act of Mortmain does not apply to the Isle of Man; and, consequently, bequests of landed property may at any time be made to corporate bodies as well as to private individuals.

The early medical studies of the bishop were turned by him to great account, and—

"He practised as a physician, bodily as well as spiritually, to the poo of the island. He kept a constant store of medicines, which he distributed, as well as his advice, gratis. His private papers note almost annually, the gift of sums of money for the erection of churches, parsonages, and school-houses in his own diocese and elsewhere. He always kept an open hospitable table, covered with the produce of his own demesnes, in a plentiful though not extravagant manner; and he maintained in his own house, under his own immediate care and instruction, candidates for holy orders."

Bishop Wilson died in 1755. His monument is in Kirk Michael church-yard: it bears a record rather than a memorial, stating who sleeps there in Jesus, but not how the sleeper lived to Christ. It was erected by his son, "Thomas Wilson, D.D., who, in obedience to the express command of his worthy father, declines giving him the character he so justly deserves. Let this island speak the rest."

Perhaps, one of the finest testimonials ever paid to character —the most delicate homage ever paid to worth—was rendered by Cardinal Fleury, prime minister of France, to this exemplary Protestant divine, when the former, during a war between England and France, ordered all the privateers of his country to spare the Isle of Man in consideration of the almost godlike character of him who was the spiritual ruler and the general benefactor of the island.

During his episcopate, ecclesiastical censures were submitted to with an obedient respect that would not now be rendered them. Bishop Wilson himself accounted for this by the fact that in his day there was no professedly Christian community in the island, besides the Established Church, to which excommunicated persons might betake themselves. In his "History of the Isle of Man," he says, that excepting a family or two of Quakers, Dissenters of any denomination there were none—a statement which differs altogether from one made by Mr. Cumming, who says that Dissenters used to attend his church, and receive at his hand the communion of the Lord. A proof that the Churchmen of his day were zealous in their vocation may, perhaps, be found in the fact, that the attendance of six hundred at the communion, in a country parish church at Easter, was a very common occurrence. Mr. Cumming shall speak as to the condition of things while we write:—

"Almost within the short space of a mile, which intervenes between the church-yard where Bishop Wilson was interred and the palace where he lived, are two meeting-houses filled each succeeding Sunday with parishioners zealously attached to Wesleyanism, in its different connections; and such is pretty generally the case throughout the island. The meeting-houses out-number the parish churches in the proportion of four to one, and the congregations assembling within each respectively, are very nearly in the same proportion. Yet the people are not hostile to though alienated from the Church, and there is far more hope of their restoration to the conformity of their forefathers than is the case with the Separatists on the other side of the water. And it is, perhaps, not too much to say, that the remembrance of the great benefits, temporal as well as spiritual, conferred upon this isle by the bishops of the Church—foremost among whom stands, and will ever stand, the holy and apostolic Wilson—has contributed very largely to keep up the feeling which doubtless still exists in the minds of the great mass of the population, that the Established Church is their Church and that it is a real blessing to the isle.'

This statement is not very encouraging, but we think that the condition of things to which it refers is not incurable. We are certain that such condition would no longer exist, if especial regard were had to suit the clergyman to the population among whom he is to minister. "Like to like" is an old adage, and it holds partly good in the circumstance upon which we now treat. Plain men to plain people, and preaching will be to edification, and example to adoption; but we must not enlarge on a topic which would require an article for itself. Let us return to the Manx Church. There—in spite of the new leaven constantly mingling with the population and new laws assimilating with those of England—there is, perhaps, more of Church dis-

cipline exercised and obeyed in Man than in the most ably-governed diocese in England. The uniformity of rubrical observation is much more exact than in England: the offertory has never been dropped, and, consequently, there has been no cudgelling of brains and composing of pamphlets to discuss the merits of a question which has been so variously tortured among *us*. The offertory in Man is the sole substitute for a public poor law, though not interfering with nor standing for private charity. Ancient Church uses still obtain. The people bow not only at the name of Jesus, but also when the *Gloria Patri* is rehearsed—a practice observed in the primitive times as an acknowledgment of the divine mystery of the Holy Trinity. The common people, too, as we are told by Bishop Hildersley, take the canonical Church hours as a standard for the reckoning of time, saying so many hours past "traa sherveish," or service time. At Christmas-eve the churches are not only decked with evergreens, but, at evening prayers, the parishioners assemble bearing in their hands large candles, and he is the happiest man who has the largest. After the prayers and sermon, intimation is made by the clergyman that, if any present have carols to sing, then is the time to commence: forthwith, choirs of singers in different parts of the church relieve each other in turn, and the singing of carols and anthems is often kept up till a late hour. St. Stephen's day is rather exceptionably observed by parties going out to stone wrens, and, with their booty as a trophy, exacting alms for the halt, the lame, and the blind. Of active charity the Manx appear to have a very excellent idea; and they proverbially say that, "When one poor man relieves another, God himself laughs outright." The convocation of the Manx clergy is held annually on the Thursday in Whitsun-week, when the bishop not only enquires into discipline, but, with the advice of his clergy, makes such constitutions as are necessary for the better government of the Church. Canons thus passed are law in the eyes of the laity, proving that the Church of the island is in itself a national and independent Church. On another subject connected with ancient feelings, Mr. Cumming says:—

"It is only very lately that the desecration of ancient churchyards and the true oratories has taken place. There was a strong feeling in their behalf even within the present century. A case of seeming divine retribution, in one instance, where, in an act of apparent necessity, a species of sacrilege was committed, is often brought forward as having occurred in the parish of Jurby. A farmer in that parish, during a violent storm of thunder and lightning, drove his sheep for

shelter into one of the old chapels which I have noted as so frequent on the isle, which, at that time (about seventy years ago), had the roof on it. It was afterwards observed that the farmer lost all the lambs of that flock the ensuing spring, and that many of them were born monstrosities. The story was related to me by a clergyman whose grandfather was the farmer in question: it, at any rate, exhibits the feeling then prevalent, and bears out the statement of Bishop Wilson that the Manx have generally held sacrilege to such a degree that they do not think a man can wish a greater curse to a family than in these words:—'Clagh ny killagh ayns corneil dty hie wooas!" May a stone of the church be found in a corner of thy dwelling!"

It only remains for us to say that eleven bishops have presided over the Manx Church since the death of Wilson, in 1755. The present Bishop of Rochester was the last Bishop of Man, appointed by the Duke of Atholl in right of his sovereign title in Man. He succeeded Dr. Cregan, the see having actually been kept vacant for him after Dr. Cregan's death until he, the Hon. George Murray, the duke's nephew, was of age for consecration. The latter occurred in 1813, and Mr. Murray remained in the occupation of the see until he was translated to that of Rochester, in 1827. During the episcopate of Dr. Ward, his successor, the Act for Uniting the See of Man with that of Carlisle was passed; but, in consequence of the violent opposition offered to it, it never became law and the scheme was wisely abandoned. The present bishop is Dr. Eden, brother to the Earl of Auckland, First Lord of the Admiralty: "his lordship who, previous to his appointment (1847) to the bishopric of Sodor and Man, had been fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge, chaplain to the Queen, and vicar of Battersea, Surrey, is heir-presumptive to the barony of Auckland." As bishop of this ancient see he is also the highest member in the Lower House of the English Convocation. The Bishop of Man has a seat in the House of Lords within the bar, but no vote. It is said that, if the island estates, as in case of treason, should become forfeit to the Crown, the bishop would then have a vote as well as a seat; because, in such case, he would hold his barony from the Sovereign. This, however, would depend upon whether the bishop holds a seat in the Lords *de suo jure*. We are rather disposed to think that, even if the bishop's claim to sit and vote were admitted, it would be made subject to the new regulation, and depend as to its being effected upon whether the bishop ranked among the junior nominations which only admit prospectively to the peerage, or otherwise. As it is, without the hypotheti-

cal case of treason put above, by Crutwell in his "Life of Bishop Wilson," the Bishop of Man *does* hold his barony directly from the Crown, the latter having purchased both barony and bishopric, or right of appointment to it, from a subject. Mr. Cumming is of opinion that, if the Sovereign thought fit, the bishop might be summoned to the House of Lords, "unless (he adds) the circumstance of his having a seat in an independent legislature within the dominions of Great Britain should seem to preclude him"—a circumstance, we may state, of very considerable weight, and which has not occurred so often as it might to those who have advocated the admissibility of the Manx bishop to the privilege of a vote as well as to the honour of a seat in the British House of Lords.

In these times of reality and rapidity it is pleasant to know that our good friends the fairies are not quite extinct, and that they still linger among the vallies and dells, in moonlit fields and by favoured human dwellings, in the Isle of Man. *Ballabona*, or Fairy-bridge, still commemorates their doings in past days, and gives authority, perhaps, for their present existence. They do not, indeed, manifest themselves visibly to mortal eyes, as they were wont to do in the old days before newspapers; but most mortals of rustic breeding in this island are even yet influenced by a superstitious feeling of reverence for the elfish people themselves, as well as for the localities which tradition has rendered sacred to their revels. This superstition stands some of them in good stead: it causes them to keep good hours, and there are some among them who would not, without much labour of persuasion, be induced to trust themselves out during the witching hours of night without a companion. They are kind to the "good people" even while they fear them—perhaps because they fear them—and, during the stormy nights of winter, the mountain peasants will retire early to their truckle couch in order that the weather-beaten elves may resort to their hearth and find comfort in nestling down before the smouldering embers of their turf-fire. They are not without irascible feelings, and woe to the person and goods of a drunkard who should speak ill of them when cup-valiant! Some peasants have been introduced to the gay summer halls of their own, where they hold their June revels; and it was well for them if they refrained from putting their lips to the charmed goblets of provoking beverage that were incessantly offered to them. They became prisoners for ever if they did, and their escape was generally owing to the warnings, pinches, and pluckings by the coat tail of those luckless individuals who had fallen into temptation before them—who were captives in

fairy halls for ever—and who were endowed with sufficient good nature not to wish for further human companionship in their magic-wrought doom. Shall such not be faith to a Manx peasant? How can it be otherwise? Is not the sacramental cup in Kirk Malew a fairy goblet once presented to a farmer at a midnight meeting of fairies, but the goblin-brewed drink in which he dashed upon the ground, and therewith found himself standing alone and in darkness in the middle of his own field, with this very cup in his hand? It was by the advice of his parish priest that he devoted this same cup to the service of the Church. It was there in the days of Waldron, the annalist; and, if it be not there in our days, the tradition, the memory of it, is, which is much the same, and therein much veneration exists for a race who holds such dangerous temptations to the lips of thirsty men, who can lift tons of quarz boulders to crush those who defy them; and who, it is shrewdly suggested, annually pass in and out of the island carriaged in the rum puncheons which enter Douglas brimming with liquid fire, and which return empty, save that the elves are in them, to Jamaica. What they do on the voyage we are not prepared to say: perhaps, they study those diapasonic differences or concords which, according to the ingenious and philosophic Bacon, are said to exist in the same barrel when full and when empty.

The mention of the name of Bacon reminds us that his person and fate are in some degree connected with the traditions of the island. On a wild crag, the highest point of the Calf Islet, and nearly five hundred feet above the level of the sea, a man built himself a hut, now far short of two centuries ago, and for some time lived there in lofty but painful seclusion. The name of the solitary was Bushel, and he was the friend of the great but erring Chancellor. In a manuscript history, left behind him, he gives the following as the motives which induced him to shun the world, and to mourn over the fallen fortunes, not of himself alone, but also of his friend:—

"The embrions of my mines proving abortive by the sudden fall and death of my late friend the Chancellor Bacon, in King James's reign, were the motives which persuaded my pensive retirement to a three years' unsociable solitude in the desolate island called the Calf of Man, where, in obedience to my dead lord's philosophical advice, I resolved to make a perfect experiment upon myself for the attaining of a long and healthy life (most necessary for such a repentance as my former debauchedness required), as by a parsimonious diet of herbs, oil, mustard, and honey with water sufficient, most like to that of our long-lived forefathers before the flood (as was conceived by that lord),

which I most strictly observed, as if obliged by a religious vow, till Divine Providence called me to a more active life."

The isle appears to have been a chosen resort of penitents. Wood speaks of one who, in the reign of Elizabeth, had murdered a lady in a fit of jealousy, and who took refuge in the desolatensss and seclusion of the Calf of Man.

From the summit of the gravel boss of the Calf Islet was once witnessed a scene, some account of which will serve as a specimen of the rich legendary history scattered about these pages. It appears that, in the early days of Olave Godredson, a Norman baron, with dreadfully sporting propensities, had so nearly exhausted the race of bisons and elks that, to check the hunter and save what they could of the little he had left, the people had, of course, recourse to magic. While he was one day chasing the red deer of the Calf, and his stout-lunged cook, Eaoch, was sleeping by the side of the boiling pot in the castle kitchen at Barrull, a Manx witch, named Ada, set the fat running over and therewith put fire to the castle. Eaoil roared so loud that his master, the Baron Kitter, heard him, though ten miles off. He jumped into a boat with all his followers to gain the main island from the Calf; but the witch touched the helm, the prow touched a rock, and the whole of them went to the bottom. The poor cook was forthwith seized as the author of all the evil and condemned to death, with the solitary privilege, allowed to that early Ude, of choosing how he would die. "Well (said Eaoch to Olave the King), if it be so, I wish my head to be laid across one of your Majesty's legs, and there cut off by your majesty's sword *Macabuin*, which was made by Loan Maclibhuin, the dark smith of Drontheim." The king's scimitar was so tempered that it would cleave through a mountain of granite: he felt, we may suppose, a little, uneasy about the *tibia* and *fibula;* but his word was pledged and his pledge was not to be forfeited. All the precaution taken was by Ada the witch—who placed a dressing of nine times nine filthy and witch-like components between his majesty's leg and the head of Eaoch the cook—

"All these things (says Mr. Cumming) being properly adjusted, the great sword *Macabuin*, made by Maclibhuin, the dark smith of Drontheim, was lifted with the greatest caution by one of the king's most trusty servants, and laid gently on the neck of the cook; but ere its downward course could be stayed, it severed the head from the body of Eaoch, and cut all the preventives asunder except the last, thereby saving the king's leg from harm. When the dark smith of Drontheim heard of the stratagem submitted to by Olave to thwart the efficacy of

the sword *Macabuin*, he was so highly offended that he despatched his hammerman, Hiallus-nanurd, who had only one leg, having lost the other when assisting in making that great sword, to the Castle of Peel, to challenge King Olave, or any of his people, to walk with him to Drontheim. It was accounted very dishonourable in those days to refuse a challenge, particularly if connected with a point of honour. Olave, in mere compliance with this rule, accepted the challenge, and set out to walk against the one-legged traveller from the Isle of Man to the smithy of Loan Maclibhuin, in Drontheim. They walked o'er the land, and sailed o'er the sea; and so equal was the match that, when within sight of the smithy, Hiallus-nanurd, who was first, called to Loan Maclibhuin to open the door, and Olave called out to shut it. At that instant, pushing past him of the one leg, the king entered the smithy first, to the evident discomfiture of the swarthy smith and his assistant. To show that he was not in the least fatigued, Olave lifted a large forge hammer, and, under pretence of assisting the smith, struck the anvil with such force that he clave it, not only from top to bottom, but also the block upon which it rested. Emergaid, the daughter of Loan, seeing Olave perform such manly prowess, fell so deeply in love with him that, during the time her father was replacing the block and the anvil, she found an opportunity of informing him that her father was only replacing the studdy to finish a sword he was making, and that he had decoyed him to that place for the purpose of destruction, as it had been prophesied that the sword would be tempered in royal blood, and in revenge for the affront of the cook's death by the sword of *Macabuin*. 'Is not your father the son of old Windy Cap, King of Norway?' said Olave. 'He is,' replied Emergaid, as her father entered the smithy. 'Then (cried the King of Man, as he drew the red steel from the fire) the prophecy must be fulfilled!' Emergaid was unable to stay his uplifted hand till he quenched the sword in the blood of her father, and afterwards pierced the heart of the one-legged hammerman, who he knew was in the plot for taking his life."

Such a dramatic legend would be nothing without a conclusion, with a marriage tacked to it. Accordingly, the legend of the cook and the one-legged hammerman terminated conjugally. Emergaid married with alacrity the royal murderer of her father: just as Chimene, but with more show of reluctance, espoused the valiant Cid, who very properly slew that tedious and rude old gentleman, Don Gomez, the lady's sire. As for the Manx legend, we suppose there is a moral to it, if it could be found for the seeking. To our thinking the chief instruction conveyed by it is, that cooks should not go to sleep by the kitchen fire; and that, if they do, it is perfectly impossible for them to calculate the consequences. At the same time, every cook who falls asleep is not to suppose, on awaking, that the the first step has been made towards the marriage of a king with a monarch's grand-daughter.

The headlands of the isle commemorate in this manner many

events and incidents of the past. Thus, Spanish Head records the visit and the wreck of a portion of that invincible armada which issued so gloriously from Spain never to return, and which flung itself and its cargo of warriors, priests, torturers, and weapons, as trophies, on the shore of the land of that people which they came to subdue to Spain, convert to Rome, and to put to the cruel question or to the death endured by martyrdom. To the shores of Man the division of the armada, which rushed upon the coast to meet destruction, conveyed the progenitors to which is owing that breed of tailless cats which is peculiar to the island. The Shetlanders ascribe their celebrated ponies to a similar circumstance—viz., the wreck of a division of the demon fleet, and the coming ashore of a few Spanish jennets, the sires and dams of that shaggy-maned race on which our young nobility first learn to acquire a seat and find a home in the saddle. The jennets of Spain, from which our Shetland ponies are descended, are said to be themselves the offspring of the winds. It is a legend, perhaps, to characterize their once famed swiftness. However this may be, Virgil records this descent from fabulous sires; and Horace and Silius tell us that their blood was the favourite beverage of the wild and valorous Concani. The Tartars, we may add, of this day, do the same; and more, a Tartar "not only rides but eats his horse." The horses of Diomedes, on the other hand, eat men, as did those of Glaucus, who fed upon their master. The horses of King Duncan, it will be remembered, foreshadowed the king's death by devouring one another, very much, as old Ross says—

> "——— to the amazement of mine eyes
> That look'd upon't."

King William's Bank is as another page in a dread journal, recording a fearful escape from death. The ship which conveyed the hero, whose crusade against popery has rendered him so distasteful to Tractarian writers, had here well nigh made wreck of Cæsar and his fortunes. The monarch was on his way to Ireland and the Boyne. Had his career been stopped for ever on this bank, the whole present condition of the world might never have been. The victory of Boyne Water influenced the events of the entire of Europe. Had it not been given to poets to sing that triumph, there perhaps would have been no pretender—Charles Stuart would not have turned sot—England might have been preserved to the unhappy race whom Tractarians deplore, and Mr. Oakeley might have been born a Papist instead of having become one by force of development.

The exploits and the death of Thurôt, the French buccaneer,

have their memento on the north of the island. About the middle of last century the name was a sound of uneasiness to all the families dwelling on our coasts. Trained to smuggling, and well acquainted with every inlet where contraband goods could be run, he was a man to be feared by exposed districts. In 1759 he was so well appreciated by his own government that they gave him the command of a squadron of five ships, with which he invaded Ireland and plundered Carrickfergus. The English, however, were soon at his heels, and Captain Elliot, with three vessels, finally came to close quarters with him off the north coast of the Isle of Man. The marauding French commodore was defeated, with immense loss on his own side, and with little on the side of his conquerors. He himself was slain by a grape-shot while endeavouring to animate his crew to a last effort. He had no sooner fallen than his own men flung him overboard and surrendered. The waves bore his body to Scotland, casting it ashore on the Mull of Galloway. In the grave-yard of Kirkmaiden, within sound of the mysterious voices of the ocean, sleeps the fierce sea-captain of Dunkirk. The bowsprit of his own vessel, the *Bellish*, struck off during the action, was washed ashore near Bishop's Court. In memory of the action Bishop Hildersley raised it as a trophy of victory on Mount Æolus, a little above the garden of his episcopal residence.

We must now close with regret the interesting volume before us, and that without noticing many details of importance on which we would fain have tarried. For the history, fortunes, and prospects of King William's College, we must refer our readers to Mr. Cumming himself. Like reference we must make with regard to the Manx herring-fishery, and to all who are curious therein. The Manx language, of which some curious illustrations and a clever analysis are given, must even, and with many other subjects, reckon in the same category. Above all, we must leave untouched the geological portion of the volume. This portion, scientific as the subject is upon which it treats, is popularly written, and will tend to make geologists of readers who deeply declined the study of the oldest book in nature before they opened the one presented to them by the learned Vice-Principal of King William's College, Castletown. We must, perforce, be silent on this matter: for want of room, we are compelled to refrain from writing on lithology, from discussing granite bubbles, or touching upon schistose formations. We leave unquestioned the matters of the Palæozoic, the Devonian, or any other geological period: we may not enjoy leisure in beds of carbon, trap, or limestone; nor refresh our-

selves with dips into glacial deposits: we may, however, find space to say that, with regard to the question touching the encroachments of land or sea—whether the land has gone down or the sea come up—Mr. Cumming, in treating of certain coast aspects on one side of the island, says, that no geologists will subscribe to the supposition of the sea *coming up*. It has now become an axiom, he tells us, that nothing is so stable as the sea and nothing so unstable as the land; and, like a good man, who does not remain satisfied with letting assertion stand for argument, he proceeds to prove what he advances. For the nature and details of the proof we must refer our readers, once more, to the pages which Mr. Cumming has written for their profit and pleasure. To show how well, how skilfully, how suggestively, the reverend and learned author can write upon subjects of rare philosophy—and how cleverly he can find sermons in and make sermons *out* of stones—we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of making this final extract: he is speaking of the great gravel platform which once united Man to the other islands forming our triple kingdom, and these to Europe:—

"In speaking (he says) of the *destruction* of this great gravel platform, nothing has as yet been said of the time taken up in its *formation*. We have not spoken of the years during which the different pebbles, of which it is in great part composed, were being rolled about and rounded in their present shape, after they were broken off from their parent rock, and exposed to the action of the tides upon the coast..... Many of them existed as pebbles in an older formation (the boulder clay) out of which they were washed, and sifted, and sorted, ere they were distributed as layers in the more recent drift.....The rock itself, from which they were originally broken, was once a bank of sand or mud, which had been formed by quiet deposit of layer upon layer at the bottom of the sea before it was consolidated, and then heaved up to become a coast line, and again exposed to the breakers.....Wave upon wave broke upon that first granite mass which appeared above the primæval ocean, and so wore it away, particle after particle, to form the *first* sedimentary deposit. We can measure our own age and the age of our most lasting works by the grains of sand which run through our hour-glasses; but, to measure the age of those very sands, we must apply cycles made up of the revolutions of the sun itself about the far-off centre of our sidereal system."

After this extract, it were superfluous to say that the tendency of the volume is to raise the mind of the reader from contemplating the creation to reverence the Creator. We need add nothing to this; for we could give no higher eulogy to a volume proceeding, as this does, from the pen of a scholar and a gentleman, a philosopher and a Christian.

ART. IV.—*A Pilgrimage to Rome: containing some Account of the High Ceremonies, the Monastic Institutions, the Religious Services, the Sacred Relics, the Miraculous Pictures, and the General State of Religion in that City.* By the Rev. M. HOBART SEYMOUR, M.A. London: Seeleys, 1848, pp. 623, 8vo.

WE now fulfil the pledge given to our readers at the close of the last number of our journal, of introducing them to the knowledge of Mr. Seymour's deeply interesting "Pilgrimage to Rome," which was published as our last sheet was going to press.

Having spent many years in Ireland as a "working curate," Mr. Seymour had ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with the doctrines and practices of popery in that priest-enslaved country. Being desirous of investigating that unscriptural and antiscriptural system of error and superstition, as it actually exists at Rome, he spent several months in that city, where he enjoyed peculiar advantages for surveying the various phases which popery assumes. The result of his observations is delivered in the present volume.

Mr. Seymour entered Italy by way of Switzerland, of the scenery and religious state of which country he has given some valuable descriptions; and his careful examination of the condition of the Protestants and Papists enables him to confirm the remark which has often been made by observant travellers, viz., "that in all the comfort, the independence, and the education which constitute modern civilization, the cantons which are Protestant are far in advance of those that are Roman Catholic."

On leaving Switzerland, Mr. Seymour visited the celebrated cathedral of Milan, in which are deposited the relics of Carlo Borromeo, one of the canonised saints of the Romish Church.

"And if in his life he loved not 'the pomps and vanities' of the world, he has at least in his death as ample a share as the most ambitious could desire. The poor fleshless skeleton, there waiting till the resurrection-morning, will arise, clothed in the richest costume of silver and gold, with rings, and chains, and crosier studded with the most brilliant and precious gems, enshrined in a case of chrystal of incalculable costliness. There the eyeless skull—the noseless face—the grinning mouth exhibits a ghastly sight—a hideous and loathsome and sickening spectacle, mocking the gorgeous and splendid trappings in which the skeleton is arrayed. Multitudes kneel and pray to this ghastly spectacle, which seems to mock the eyeless skull with such pompous pageantry" (p. 51).

The gates of the church of St. Ambrose are *said* to be the identical gates which he shut in the face of his sovereign, the Emperor Thodosius. And in that church is also said to be deposited the original serpent of brass which Moses lifted up in the Wilderness! It is placed on a lofty column, and is regarded with superstitious veneration. It is certain, however, that Hezekiah caused it to be broken to pieces, to prevent the Israelites from burning incense to it (2 Kings xviii. 4); and it is (as Mr. Seymour remarks) a perplexing enquiry to ascertain how, unbroken and entire, it was presented to the church, seventeen centuries after it had been broken to pieces. "But difficulties and perplexities of this kind are easily resolved under an Italian sky." When the sacristan was reminded that this pretended relic had been broken to pieces by Hezekiah, he smartly replied, "*Non e certo.*"

From Milan, Mr. Seymour proceeded through Pavia, Genoa, Lucca, and Tuscany, to Rome. His notices of the country through which he passed are replete with interest: but as his researches and observations were principally directed to the usages and doctrines of the Romish Church, we shall follow him in that important topic.

The monastic institutions first attracted his attention: and the result of his enquiries is, that—

"The convents of the higher classes in Italy are neither more nor less than large boarding-houses for the younger sons of the aristocracy—a sort of club, arranged in an Italian fashion, where they can live cheaply and well, and enjoy the society of those who are in every respect their equals, within the establishment, and at all times go forth to enjoy any society more suited to their tastes, without the establishment. And, under a system like this, it is contrary to all experience of mankind, and all knowledge of the world, to suppose that in such large assemblages of young and unmarried men, there should not be a certain amount of irregularity and impropriety. The climate and society of Italy have never been remarkable for purity of morals.

"The results are what might be anticipated. Some, whose inclinations lead them to study, devote themselves to the acquisition of knowledge in the various departments of literature, and have proved themselves among the most intellectual, learned, and able men of the age, while they are the most polished and agreeable companions. Some, whose tendencies are towards religion, or whose ambition is to rise in the state, devote themselves to the acquisition of ecclesiastical knowledge and political intrigue, which fill, at Rome, the place of parliamentary talent to the ambitious aspirant in England; the only channel to power at Rome being through the Church. Others, whose indolence or whose recklessness make them indifferent to such things, devote themselves to the amusement of the passing hour. And accordingly they are seen in the drawing-room, and in the billiard-room, and at the gaming-

table; and in every place of fashion or amusement. Truly, they are sometimes where they ought not to be—realizing the old song—"upstairs and down-stairs, *and in my lady's chamber*" (pp. 178, 179).

The convents, which are exclusively appropriated to the inferior classes of society, are chiefly those of the Franciscan and Capuchin orders, whose coarse brown dresses, shaven crowns, wooden-sandalled feet, cord, rosary, shaven face of one order, and long beards of the other, are familiar to every eye; while the filth of their persons and the odour of their clothes are no less familiar to every traveller. The dirt and stench of the cells of one of these convents, which contained one hundred and seventy monks, whose ages varied for the most part from twenty-five to forty years, Mr. Seymour states, are equalled only by a squalid garret in St. Giles's, in London. All the inmates—

"Without exception, seemed of the class of the lowest labouring population; many of these monks being unable to read or write; so that though the establishment might in theory be regarded by some minds as a holy and Christian home and retreat for pious and devoted men from the lower classes of society, yet in actual practice it was a sort of overgrown almshouse, a sort of union poor-house, the inmates of which were not the sick and the infirm, and the aged, as in England, but the strong, the active, the healthy, and the able-bodied of the population, who ought to have been compelled to labour for their support. And as for this and the other similar establishments of Franciscans and Capuchins, as houses for the pious and the holy, it needs not that any man should be informed that the inmates are often the most vicious and depraved even in Italy" (p. 181).

The monks in these establishments are chiefly maintained by the execrable traffic in masses, for the relief of souls in purgatory.

The monasteries, as nunneries are called in Italy, are represented by Mr. Seymour in a more favourable point of view: and however inexcusable such establishments may be in France or England, in Germany or Switzerland, the establishment of them in Italy he considers as a sad and melancholy necessity arising out of the moral state of society in that beautiful country:—

"That which seems to be the governing influence with the parents, next to the desire to secure protection from the vices of the world, a protection supposed to be found in the cloister, is the facility afforded by monasteries for the permanent provision and settlement of their daughters. In England this is contemplated either in connection with a suitable marriage, or with an adequate income for their station in society as unmarried persons. But in Italy this matter is at once settled by the monastic establishments; for if a parent has once placed his unmarried or unmarrigeable daughter in any sisterhood—has once settled her in any nunnery—he is understood to have provided

for her and settled her in a most respectable way, having cared alike for her bodily and spiritual requirements. And this is most easily accomplished. A sum equal to from two hundred to five hundred pounds paid to the monastery secures all that an Italian parent of the class of gentry thinks necessary for his daughter. She becomes after her noviciate one of the sisterhood, and has a legal right to all the privileges of the establishment during her life. The donation required by the several monasteries varies according to the greater or smaller degree of comfort and luxury that reign within. In some monasteries the sisterhood are but poorly off—have little of the comforts of life—have none of its luxuries, and are engaged in teaching or in needlework or such occupation. In others, which are connected with the less rigid orders, the whole style of living is different. The sisters have their own separate apartments—have every comfort in the way of furniture—have decent luxuries of living—have great facilities, where it is not a *clausura*, for receiving the visits of their female friends, and thus enjoy in some respects a very easy life. Admission into the privileges of this latter class requires a donation of from five hundred to a thousand pounds, according to the measure of comforts and luxuries allowed in the several nunneries; the whole system being very judiciously arranged, so as to have monasteries adapted to the wants and capacities of every class of society" (pp. 194, 196).

Thus, these establishments are the creatures of convenience rather than of religion.

Mr. Seymour has given a graphic delineation of the ceremony of taking the veil, for which our readers must consult his volume, as well as for an able and candid chapter on the Jesuits, whose moral character as individuals has never been impeached, whatever may be the other delinquencies of that order. The various high ceremonies and religious services of the Romish Church form the subject of two long and interesting chapters. Of the idolatrous worship of the material cross, Mr. Seymour has given abundant evidence confirmatory of that which we have on various occasions laid before the readers of this *Review*. The following is the ceremony of the adoration of the cross by the Pope and Cardinals in the Sistine Chapel on Good Friday:—

"A monk approached the throne of the Pope, soon after his entrance, and on his knees asked a blessing for himself, and craved an indulgence for others. His request was granted, and he entered the pulpit and preached a sermon of *seven minutes* duration; and sitting down, he again rose and read publicly the form of indulgence, for thirty years and thirty quaterns. The following is the rubric.

"'He approaches the throne, and bending on his knees without kissing the foot, demands the usual indulgence of thirty years and as many quaterns, which he publishes after the sermon in the usual form.'

"A quatern is forty days, so that thirty of these being added to the thirty years, the indulgence is one of thirty years and twelve hundred days.

"The ceremony of the day then commences.

"A cross made of wood stands upon the altar. It is enveloped in a black veil. The deacon hands it to the officiating cardinal. He, standing with his back to the altar and his face to the people, holds the cross before the eyes of the congregation. Then loosening the black veil which envelopes it, he uncovers one arm of the cross—pauses—holds it conspicuously before the congregation, and exclaims with a loud voice—

"'Behold the wood of the cross!'

"And the response bursts from the choir,

"'Come, let us adore it!'

"And immediately the Pope, the Cardinals, and all present kneel and adore it, and then resume their seats.

"Again the officiating Cardinal uncovers the second arm of the cross—pauses—exclaims as before—

"'Behold the wood of the cross!'

"And the response again bursts from the choir,

"'Come, let us adore it!'

"And, as before, the Pope, the Cardinals, and all present kneel and adore it, and then resume their seats.

"Again, the officiating Cardinal uncovers the whole cross—pauses—and exclaims as before—

"'Behold the wood of the cross!'

"And the response again bursts from the choir,

"'Come, let us adore it!'

"And immediately the Pope, the Cardinals, and all present kneel and adore it a third time.

"All this was painful enough to me, yet it proved only 'the beginning of sorrows.' There was a solemnity—a silence, a stillness in all, which, combined with the appearance of the chapel, made it very impressive: and this very impressiveness it was that made all so painful.

"The Cardinal with his assistants left the altar, and placed the cross on a cushion, on the floor of the chapel, a few paces from the steps of the altar, and retired.

"And here the ceremony commenced indeed. Two or three Cardinals approached the Pope, they stripped off his splendid robes, they removed his glittering mitre, they took off his embroidered shoes, they laid aside his spangled gloves, till he stood before his throne without one emblem of his royal or papal office. There stood the old man, bare-headed and bare-footed, and stripped till he seemed to retain little else than a loose white dressing-gown, the dress of a monk of Camaldoli. There he stood, not alone, as if the act were a voluntary humiliation, but in the hands of the Cardinals, who, intending to help him and uphold him, seemed to be his guards to force and compel him. There the old man no longer looking like a Pope, descended from the throne and seemed like one led away to be punished, or to do pe-

nance. I could not help thinking that the old man was, in a great measure, an unwilling actor in this scene; there was much uneasiness in his manner—there was dissatisfaction in his face: and his whole appearance was that of a man who was obliged to act against his conscience, in complying with a custom of the Church.

"Having conducted the Pope to the end of the chapel, they turned and faced the cross, which lay on the floor, near the steps of the altar. There they made him kneel and adore it. They raised him, and conducting him some two or three paces nearer, they again made him kneel a second time and adore the cross. Then again they raised him, and leading him nearer still, they again the third time made him kneel and adore the cross. Here at the cross they raised him, and then again he knelt, then rose again and then knelt again. Prostrate before it, on knees and hands he kissed it, and, according to custom, left an hundred scudi of gold as an offering beside it. He was afterwards conducted to his throne and robed, while the most exquisite music from the choir accompanied the whole ceremony.

"When this is completed by the Pope, the same act is performed by each of the Cardinals, all without shoes, adoring and kissing the cross. These are followed by the bishops, heads of orders, &c., all adoring it in like manner, and all making to it an offering of money.

"The deacons then spread the cloth on the altar, light the candles, and reverently place the cross, no longer on the floor, but on the altar amidst the candlesticks" (pp. 370—373).

Such is the adoration of the cross at Rome, the imposing ceremony of which affected Mr. Seymour even to tears. However solemn and impressive the act may have been, "it bore" (he truly remarks) "every character of idolatry. A few considerations will justify this statement:"—

"1. The cross, that was thus solemnly adored, was not adored as being the symbol of a crucified Saviour. It was not the sign or symbol of a doctrine. There was special care taken that it should not be so regarded. The words were not *ecce crucem*, but *ecce lignum crucis;* and this is the distinction always used among theologians between the *doctrine* of the cross and the *wood* of the cross. This was an adoration of the wood.

"2. Neither was this adoration paid to the cross as a relic—as a supposed fragment of the true or original cross. The rubrical directions, if that term may be applied, require that this shall *not* be such relic or fragment; and it is not till the act of adoration to this mere wood of the cross has been performed that the relic or fragment of the true cross is produced and exhibited. They accordingly have two crosses for Good Friday: one, an ordinary cross of ebony, and this is the one adored; the other, composed out of relics of the true cross, is subsequently exhibited, and the first removed.

"3. The word is—Adoration: it is not *veneration*, the term usually applied to relics: nor is it *invocation*, the term applied to the saints: nor is it *worship*, a term of more general use: but it is *adoration*, which implies *divine worship*—the worship that belongs to God.

"4. That it was the highest species of worship is apparent in the manner of the act. The shoes were removed; the robes were laid aside; and greater solemnity was given to the act than I have seen in the adoration of the Host. It is remarkable, too, that there was then no host on the altar: it was in the sepulchre in the Pauline chapel. And when afterwards the Pope and Cardinals brought in the host, and paid adoration to it, in the same place where they had adored the wood of the cross, they did not remove their shoes or lay aside their robes, but adored it with far less of solemnity than they had already shown to the wood of the cross" (p. 373-375).

On the subject of indulgences Mr. Seymour has accurately exhibited the doctrine of the Romish Church, by quotations from authoritative and documentary publications, which show how easily these may be gained. One or two instances shall be given. By climbing on his knees the twenty-eight steps of the holy stairs, which are *said* to have been ascended more than once by our Divine Redeemer, the devotee may secure an indulgence of two hundred and fifty-two years—that is, nine years for every step. By kissing the two crosses in the Coliseum (a service which may be accomplished in the space of one minute), indulgences may be secured for six hundred days. This, however, is nothing to what an able-bodied man may accomplish, in a comparatively short space of time. A learned American traveller, who resided a considerable time at Rome, informs us that—

"At sun-rise he might kiss [one of the two] crosses in the Coliseum, and obtain two hundred days' indulgence in a moment. He might hurry to the church of St. Pudens and St. Pudentiana, and during a half-hour's mass secure to himself three thousand years' indulgence, and the remission of a third part of his sins. Returning by the way of Ara Cœli he can recite the litanies of the most blessed Virgin on the altar of her, who by Papal authority is called the Refuge of Sinners, and he has two hundred days more of indulgence, which he may either keep himself or give to one of his dead friends. If he has three pauls" (thirty cents, or fifteen-pence sterling) "in his pocket, he may exercise his charity towards that friend still further, by having a mass said expressly for his soul by one of the monks or any other priest, and thus deliver it at once from the torments of purgatory. Crossing thence to the Mamertine prison, he may gain twelve hundred years in indulgence, or on a Sunday or festival morning ten thousand four hundred years, and the remission of another third part of his sins. Here, also, if he has another thirty cents to spare, he can pay for another mass, and liberate another friend from purgatory. Thus he may, before breakfast, every day of his life obtain, for himself at least more than 4,300 years' indulgence, and the remission of two-thirds of his sins; and for the expence of sixty cents" (half-a-crown) "he may liberate two souls from purgatory"—(*Rev. Dr. Jarvis's* "*No Union with Rome*," p. 39. Hartford, Connecticut, 1843).

Mr. Seymour was deeply interested in the relics of the saints, which are preserved in the different churches at Rome. This may be accounted for by the innate reverence which exists in the human heart for the remains of a much-loved friend. "Association is a powerful law of our nature; and if we could be sure that we possessed any such memorial of our Redeemer, or of his apostles, or of any of the martyrs who shed their blood rather than depart from the stedfast confession of his name, we should certainly prize them in proportion to the fervour of our affections. But what evidence have we of such possessions? The only reverence, paid by devout men to the remains of the early martyrs, consisted in carrying them to their burial, and making great lamentation over them (Acts viii. 2). The anniversary of their deaths was celebrated at their graves, and at a later period churches were built there. But there is no proof of the disinterment of their bones, or the collection of relics, until the close of the fourth century. At that time so uncertain was the evidence of their identity, that recourse was had to the demonstrations of miraculous power. As a dead man had been revived by the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21), the sacred history suggested a precedent for similar wonders. But even in the days of Augustine the venders of false relics had begun their frauds; for he speaks of many hypocrites, under the garb of monks, strolling through the provinces, uncommissioned and wandering everywhere under various pretexts; *some selling members of martyrs,* IF *indeed they be of martyrs;* others extolling their fringes and phylacteries; others seeking their relations."*

Mr. Seymour has transcribed the catalogues of the relics preserved in the churches of Santa Croce della Gerusalemme and of St. Praxede, and he has given interesting descriptions of the exhibitions of relics, at which the Pope was present; and the conclusion to which he comes is, that the outward form of reverence, worship, or adoration paid to the relics is, in every the minutest particular, identically the same as that paid to the host, or consecrated wafer-god.

The great mine from which the relics are extracted is the catacombs of Rome, in which the heathen Romans for ages buried the poorer classes and their slaves. In succeeding ages they became the asylum of the persecuted Christians, thousands of whom there slept the sleep of death, and left their remains until the morning of the resurrection. According to the Roman

* Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to Milner's End of Religious Controversy," p. 229. New York, 1847.

Guide-book,* ecclesiastical writers *say* that fourteen popes and about one hundred and seventy thousand martyrs are buried there. A pretty good stock in trade this! And when it is remembered that so many fictitious saints, so many saints, Paralipomenon (Chronicle), and Veronica (Lat. *Vera Icon.*), have been fabricated, there can be no lack of subjects. And if there were, it is an easy matter to furnish each saint with two or three heads a-piece. "I went," says an intelligent and learned traveller,† "into a church in Turin, where the head of St. John the Baptist is venerated. This was in 1828; and in 1830 I went into a church in Rome, where also the undoubted head of St. John the Baptist received equal veneration. 'Are you sure, signor,' said I to my conductor, 'that you have the real head of St. John the Baptist?' '*Sicuro!*' said he, with the look and accent of surprise that there could be such a question asked. 'But I was told at Turin,' I rejoined, 'that they had the head of St. John the Baptist there.' Nothing daunted, he replied, 'That may well be, sir, for it is in the power of God to create two heads.'"

These absurdities are related, not as practised in some uncivilized and distant regions, but in Rome itself: and it is not the Romanism of the dark ages, but of the nineteenth century. The rulers of the Church must know better, and we cannot understand the sophistry by which men who are honest can reconcile it to their consciences to tolerate—nay, even to forward—such deceptions: yet this was done by the present Pope, who walked in procession, carrying in his hand a head which was said to be that of St. Andrew!

The extent to which this article has reached forbids us to do more than enumerate the subjects of Mr. Seymour's chapters on the inscriptions in churches, and on the uses of holy water, of pictures, and images. In conclusion, he considers Romanism as an eclectic religion, which derives its saints and images from classic mythology; its priesthood, ceremonies, and symbols, from Judaism; and its asceticism, celibacy, and monachism, from orientalism. We can safely recommend his volume to our readers, as being replete with authentic details, conveyed in a candid and Christian spirit, and which fills up an important chasm in the numerous descriptions of Rome which have been published.

---

* Nibby, "Itinerario di Roma," tom. ii. p. 535. 1827.

† Rev. Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to Milner's End of Religious Controversy," pp. 229-230.

ART. V.—*A Narrative of the Expedition sent by her Majesty's Government to the River Niger, in* 1841, *under the Command of Captain H. D. Trotter, R.N.* By Captain WILLIAM ALLEN, R.N., and T. R. H. THOMSON, M.D., Surgeon, R.N. Published with the Sanction of the Colonial Office and the Admiralty. Two Volumes. London: Bentley. 1848.

THERE is no truth of Scripture which presses more strongly on the conviction of the Christian—and the more advanced the Christian the deeper will be the impression—than that, "when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants." As with individuals so with nations: and it is, therefore, with feelings rather of humility than boastfulness that we venture to point to what England has done in the cause of religion, and, by consequence, in that of humanity. We have not done *all*—nay, we have not done even *much*, but we have done *something;* and that in "an honest and true heart," and we have not been without our reward. Our charity as a nation, if it have begun at home, has not stopped there. Wherever we have heard of misery, or oppression, or darkness abroad, we have endeavoured to alleviate it: and neither British gold nor British blood has been wanting in the cause—nay, both have been lavishly, if not always wisely, poured forth. Scarcely more than a pretext has been wanting for the large libation of either. Many of our national attempts at the amelioration of the condition of those to whom we have no other tie than that of our common humanity, have partaken of the character of a crusade, nay, in some instances of Quixotism; but a chivalric feeling has characterised and, because it was unselfish, consecrated them all. We speak not of our Indian conquests, because, although the light of our religion and the amenity of our laws have followed in the wake of our victories, the spirit of trade and the selfishness of gain have so alloyed our achievements that they are, in a scriptural sense, but as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." But when we turn to our missionary labours—to the lavish liberality which has supplied the means, and the self-devotion which has braved "the hazard"—when we regard our endeavours, but partially successful though they be, to extinguish the slave-trade—the treasure of the nation and the blood of gallant men which have been expended in the cause—we cannot but acknowledge a feeling of thankfulness to him who has put it into our hearts to will and to do these things, to the honour and glory of his holy

name, and to the promotion of the happiness of the great family of man: and, as we have already remarked, we have our reward, which we recognise in the protection of a nation, that, however unworthy of his favour, has been the honoured instrument of good in his hands. And surely, at no period of our history, could a grateful sense of this protection press itself more strongly on the national heart than at the present, when we have peace at home, while civil war—the fiercest of all wars—is raging around us. And here we are forcibly reminded of a passage in the most eloqnent and truthful book which has shed the halo of its golden light on modern literature—a book written with equal earnestness for the glory of God as for the enlightenment of man.* We allude especially to the second volume, from which we quote:—

"And deep though the causes of thankfulness must be to every people at peace with others and at unity in itself, there are causes of fear also—of fear greater than of sword or sedition—that dependence on God may be forgotten, because the bread is given and the water sure—that gratitude to him may cease because his constancy of protection has taken the semblance of a natural law—that heavenly hope may grow faint amidst the full fruition of the world—that selfishness may take place of undemanded devotion, compassion be lost in vainglory, and love in dissimulation—that enervation may succeed to strength, apathy to patience, and the noise of jesting words and foulness of dark thoughts to the earnest purity of the girded loins and the burning lamp. About the river of human life there is a wintry wind through a heavenly sunshine: the iris colours its agitation—the frost fixes upon its repose. Let us beware that our rest become not the rest of stones, which, so long as they are torrent-tossed and thunder-stricken, maintain their majesty; but, when the stream is silent and the storm passed, suffer the grass to cover them and the lichen to feed on them, and are ploughed down into dust."

We hasten to atone to such few of our readers who may deem our quotation a digression by recurring to the matter immediately in hand: and we cannot more appropriately introduce the volumes before us than by an extract which will at once show the character and results of the expedition immediately preceding that which the present work records. It forms part of a chapter devoted to a summary of the various attempts at the exploration of the Niger:—

"This mercantile expedition—which Captain, then Lieutenant W. Allen, accompanied by order of the Admiralty, for the purpose of surveying the river—was composed of one small brig, to be stationed at the mouth of the river, to receive the expected cargo of ivory; and

* "Modern Painters." By a Graduate of Oxford."

two steamers, the smaller of which—the first iron vessel that had crossed the Atlantic—was built by Mr. M'Gregor Laird, whose family were large subscribers to the expedition, and who himself bore a considerable share in the conduct of it, though the nominal command was held by Mr. Richard Lander.

"The variety of preparation required for an enterprise of such a novel nature, together with the uncertainty of the proper time for navigating the river, caused it to arrive so late that the flood had already passed its great height; consequently the vessels had to navigate a falling river, and were much impeded by shallows, so that, on reaching the confluence of the Chadda with the Niger, one of them grounded, where she remained till the river began to rise again the following year.

"The late season was also the most unhealthy; the fatal fever of the river soon attacked the crews, and out of forty-seven officers and men in the two steamers only eight survived. Mr. Laird, finding all hopes of a successful speculation to be fallacious, returned to England in the brig, which he safely navigated, although this was his first voyage. Mr. Lander made another unsuccessful attempt in a commercial point of view; but something was added to geography. Lieutenant W. Allen having, though unaided, extended his operations above the confluence of the two rivers—to Rabba on the Niger, and about eighty miles on the Chadda, the principal points of which he laid down astronomically, and gave such a sketch of the channels as proved of some service to the succeeding navigators. Mr. Lander, on his return to Ferdando Po in the *Alburkah*, hoping to be more fortunate, hastily fitted out that vessel, and sent her under the charge of Mr. Oldfield—the surviving medical officer—to re-ascend the Niger; and he followed soon after with a launch and a canoe, and a further supply of goods, which he imprudently displayed on a sand-bank before he had passed the Delta. He thus excited the cupidity of the natives, who attacked him from the banks, and in numerous canoes. Abandoning the launch, he attempted to escape down the river, keeping his pursuers at bay with a few guns, but was unhappily wounded by a musket-ball, and survived but a few days after his arrival at Fernando Po, where lie the mortal remains of this amiable and enterprising traveller; surrounded now by many of our comrades, victims of the fatal climate of the Niger."

And here we cannot but record our regret that any circumstance or considerations should have interfered with the publication of Captain Allen's narrative of his *first* attempt at the exploration of the Niger—fragments of which found their way into one of the monthly periodicals, and were of a nature that excited the liveliest desire for further details of an expedition which acquired a chivalric and romantic character from the fewness of the hands to which it was committed: in fact, Captain, then Lieutenant, Allen, was the only official person connected with it.

It is impossible to read the account of the preparations made to ensure the success of the expedition which it is the object of

these volumes to record, without being struck with the liberality and forethought which, as far as human wisdom and the light of science could aid the enterprize, had provided for every contingency. It was our privilege to inspect one of the vessels employed on the occasion; and, therefore, we can safely add our testimony to the care which had been anxiously, and without reference to expense, applied to promote, not merely the health, but the comfort of the officers and crew. We well remember with what feelings we shared the hospitalities of the gallant fellow of whose fate the saddest, but happily unfulfilled, forebodings pressed upon our hearts; nor shall we forget the parting wave of the honest hand which we did not expect to grasp again. In the inspection of the internal arrangements of the vessel, we were struck with the complicated, and, to our unscientific eyes, cumbrous, machinery referred to in the following extract:—

"To secure the vessels as much as possible against the consequences of striking on a rock, they were divided into compartments by strong iron partitions. In the larger vessels there were four of these, making five water-tight divisions, any one of which might have been filled with water without its communicating with the others; thereby very much lessening the chance of sinking. These, however, had the very great disadvantage of cutting off the free circulation of air throughout the vessels. To remedy this defect, Dr. Reid devised a system of ventilation by means of fanners worked by the engine when in action, by the current when lying in the river, or by hand if necessary: air was thus to be diffused through tubes to every part of the vessels. As, however, the atmosphere on the coast of Africa, and especially in the river Niger, was supposed to be charged with deleterious gases, the air before transmission to between decks was made to pass through a large iron chest placed on deck and capable of containing between two and three thousand cubic feet. The air in passing over chemical and other substances placed in this was supposed to be deprived of its impurities and, in a great degree, of its noxious properties.

"In the *Wilberforce*, however, it was found that a sufficient supply of air was not to be had by using the '*plenum impulse*,' or sending in fresh air: the contrary or 'vacuum' was, therefore, generally employed to exhaust the foul air from all the remote recesses and stagnant corners of the ship. By these means, whatever action took place was certainly beneficial; whereas the '*plenum*' had no appreciable effect: indeed, the whole benefit, although the system was good in theory, bore no proportion to the disadvantage of occupying so much valuable space, or the still greater evil of detention in the preparation of the apparatus.

"It is, however, easy to pronounce judgment after experience has been gained. The greatest praise and most grateful acknowledgments are due to the talented inventor for the zeal and solicitude he displayed in trying to avert, by every means that science could devise,

the baneful effects of the climate which too surely awaited us. The error was in proposing to dole out the '*pabulum vitæ*' by two small apertures to so many gasping throats, for whom the hatchways are not large enough in a hot climate."

We happen to know that some of the most zealous friends of the expedition contended that, inasmuch as the "mission was essentially one of peace," the vessel should carry none of the "munitions of war." Happily the suggestion was overruled:—

"The armament of the two larger vessels was, in each, one long brass twelve-pounder, two brass twelve-pounder howitzers, and four brass one-pounder swivels, besides musketoons and small arms. The *Soudan* had one howitzer and two swivels of smaller calibre."

On their passage out they touch at Madeira, and Captain Allen takes occasion to acknowledge the hospitalities accorded to the officers by the British residents in the island; "before saying adieu" to which the narrative states:—

"Curiosity led us to the convent, in the hope of seeing the once celebrated nun, Maria Clementina. We were informed she was no longer there; but our guide directed us to enquire for a Senorita Jeanneville, who made her appearance and looked interesting even in her sombre attire. She was rather fat, very fair, and certainly forty, with brilliant eyes expressing anything but a predilection for monastic life. In purchasing some very pretty feather flowers, we embraced the opportunity to ask her if she was ever allowed to go into society. She replied that, of late, the discipline had not been so strict; and, when very unwell, they were permitted sometimes to visit their families. A sigh, which accompanied this statement, revealed more than words could express how little, after all, her heart was in the seclusion of the convent."

One of the objects of the visit of the expedition to Sierra Leone was to procure the assistance of about one hundred negroes, of which the greater number enlisted were Krumen—a tribe to whose fidelity and intelligence all travellers with whom we have been in communication unanimously bear the most honourable testimony. The narrative informs us that—

"Our party under 'Jack Andrews' were a fine set of fellows, active and independent in their looks, but civil and hard-working. The English names by which they were entered and known on the ship's books are most amusing. Here you find 'Jack Frying-Pan' taking precedence of 'King George' and 'Prince Albert; and 'Jack Sprat,' 'Bottle of Beer,' or 'Tom Tea-Kettle' jesting with 'Prince of Wales,' or 'Duke of York.' 'Jack Andrews' was taken as the head-man: one of his best boys was 'Sam Lewis,' who subsequently proved a most diverting fellow and a very accomplished mimic and actor."

At Cape Palmas Commander W. Allen meets with an old

acquaintance, Jack Smoke: the interview and its results are highly honourable to both parties. Indeed, we are very much disposed to think, from the facts which from other sources have come to our knowledge, as well as from the information derived from the pages before us, that to the favourable impression made by Lieutentant Allen in his former expedition is to be attributed much of the facility enjoyed by the Government expedition in its communication with the natives. The savage has a far keener perception of character than is usually ascribed to him; and we can well imagine that the frankness of the sailor would make its way where the *finesse* of the diplomatist would utterly fail. But to return to 'Jack Smoke:'—

"Commander Allen went thither in search of his old and faithful servant 'Jack Smoke,' who had served him with such unwearied attention during his frequent and long illnesses on the former expedition: when there was no other person to assist him, poor 'Jack Smoke' performed the part of servant, nurse, and friend, for which he was held in most grateful recollection. 'Jack Smoke' was now enjoying the *otium cum dignitate* on the profits of that voyage which could not have been small. He was not at home to receive his visitor; but, at the door of his neat hut, Commander Allen saw an interesting young black woman playing with a very pretty chubby little naked negro boy. These proved to be Mrs. Smoke and Master Jackey. Papa was soon sent for, and expressed much gratification, in his quiet way, at the sight of his old master, who now had an opportunity of showing the estimation in which he held him by offering him the berth of second-head Kruman, which, after a slight consultation with madame, his better-half, he joyfully accepted and entered at once on his office, having no preparation and small adieux to make: he came, indeed, in a very light marching order, with nothing but his *waist-cloth* about him."

While at Cape Palmas the travellers met with a "migratory band of black ants—*termites*." We are told that their path—or rather the procession—was about three inches wide and sometimes extends for miles. Everything in the shape of food which lies in their path is quickly devoured by these hungry travellers. Snakes rendered torpid by repletion often become their prey. This latter fact we can readily believe, the experiment of tying a dead snake to a stick and thrusting it into an ant-hill being a very common one among village boys in this country: when withdrawn, after a few days, it is perfectly skeletonised.

For the information of the geologist, we may remark in passing that at Cape Palmas "the rocks, hornblende-slate, or mica-slate, protrude through the soil, which is very bad on this part of the coast." Having referred to the Krumen, as one of the most interesting of the African tribes, we venture to

quote, in support of our eulogy, some additional particulars of their history:—

"The Krumen have for a long period been connected with our trade on the west coast of Africa, and are almost the only tribe who entertained such confidence in Englishmen as to trust themselves away from their homes, and for an indefinite time, on board ship. This has now become so general among them, as the only way of acquiring riches, that nearly all the male population spend a shorter or longer term of probation either in trade-ships or in vessels of war. The commencement of their career is by an apprenticeship to a headman—generally an influential person and of great previous experience—whose duty it is to initiate his 'boys,' as they are called, into the various duties the white man may require: for this preliminary education he receives a small portion of the wages of each of his party. Every gang of krumen or fishmen has, therefore, one or more headmen, according to its numbers, who interpret the orders and see them properly executed. These superiors can alone punish the people under their care, which they do with right good will when necessary. Even on board vessels of war, they are not allowed to be punished by white men, as such a proceeding would be so offensive to either tribe that they would probably desert in a body. At Sierra Leone they have a locality called Kru Town, where they reside until their services may be required; and it is amusing to notice their variety of costume on particular occasions. Being always the highest bidders at the sale of deceased officer's effects, articles of uniform are purchased by them; and it is not unusual to see one with a post-captain's coat and epaulettes surmounting a waistcloth; or another with a scanty fold of cotton round the middle, while his head and lower extremities are severally encased in a cocked hat and pair of Wellington boots. The lucky possessors of such outward insignia of office are fond of imitating the routine of a man-of-war, in Kru Town, by mustering at divisions, the officer of the watch, spy-glass in hand, reporting to the captain, &c. This produces emulation and a desire to serve on board ship, and to merit a 'good book,' or character.

We now take up the narrative at the point at which, with reference to the object of the expedition, it begins to assume an especial interest—namely, at the entrance of the Nun branch of the Niger. About the middle of August, 1841, the three vessels crossed the bar—the mouth of the Nun.

The first interview between the commissioners and the native kings took place on the 27th of the same month, when Obi Osai, attended by his judge, or "king's mouth," Amorama, and several of the magnates of the land, came on board the *Albert*. His majesty was attired in a serjeant-major's coat (presented to him by poor Lander), and a loose pair of scarlet trousers. The commissioners explained to him the object of the expedition—namely, the abolition of the traffic in slaves;

and Obi seems to have entered into the views propounded to him, and expressed his willingness to promote them as far as his power extended. An interesting dialogue between the king and the commissioners is given, in which the replies and remarks of the former exhibit a shrewdness and intelligence scarcely to be looked for in a savage. The missionary, Mr. Schön, afterwards explained to the king the difference between the Christian and Pagan religions, recapitulating the decalogue and the more prominent doctrines of the Christian faith. The king signified his approbation by snapping his fingers, and pronouncing that it was "makka"—very good. Obi, however, at last got weary of the "palaver," and stated that he was "tired of so much talking and wished to go ashore." The negociations between the commissioners and the king result in the drawing up of a treaty which is signed by both parties on board the *Albert*. Captain Trotter then called on the Rev. Theodore Muller, chaplain to the commission, to ask a blessing on the successful commencement of their labours, intimating to Obi that he might retire or remain. Obi expressed his wish to remain, and knelt down with the rest. He shortly afterwards, from an impression that they were performing some incantation which might peril his safety, became violently agitated; and, while the perspiration streamed down his face, in the agony of his fear he called aloud for his juju-man to bring him his protecting "Arrisi," or idol. The priest, hearing the cry of his master, rushed into the cabin with the idol, a piece of blackened wood enveloped in a cloth, which the king placed between his feet, and was proceeding to offer the usual libation of palm-wine. Captain Trotter, of course disconcerted at the idea of a heathen ceremony being performed on such an occasion in his presence, caused the object of the devotional exercise to be explained to the king. This seems to have pacified the royal visitor: indeed it so far restored his good humour that the libation intended for the "Arrisi" speedily found its way down his own throat, qualified by a draught or two of some Spanish wine which was set before him. The most important part of the ceremony, however, in Obi's estimation, was yet to come—namely, the distribution of presents, with which he expressed himself much gratified; but added that he would rather have plenty of goods to "make trade," and that ships should be sent laden with European manufactures to be exchanged for the productions of his own country. Subsequent events, however, would appear to cast some doubt on the sincerity of Obi's intentions; since, on the return of the *Wilberforce*, he showed something more than indifference to his English friends.

In proceeding up the Niger they arrive at a point, the circumstances connected with which must have thrown a damp upon the spirits of the adventurers, it being that part of the river where sickness fell upon the crews of the former expedition as it were at a blow. In a few days all were seized with the river fever, with the exception of Lander and Allen, on whom, of course, devolved the attendance on the sick. Hitherto, the narrative informs us, the crews of the expedition, whose history these volumes record, had continued in good health; but they "were aware that nine of the victims of 1832 were buried on the right bank a little higher up."

Their next interview was with the Attah or King of Iddah, who, after subjecting a deputation from the commissioners to considerable delay, sent coolly to acquaint them that "he wished God to bless them, but it rained to-day; and, that as rain never falls on the king, he could not receive them." An answer to the purport that Englishmen were not to be trifled with, had the effect of producing his majesty, who behaved rather grandly on the occasion, and designated the present which had been sent him as being "only fit for a servant." He dismissed the deputation with his benediction, of which he appears to have been lavish enough, but with an intimation that he would confer with none but the chief man (captain). He seems to have been greatly amused by Mr. Schön's spectacles, which even provoked a smile from royalty, and caused the fan-bearer instantly to eclipse the kingly countenance; it being contrary to etiquette that strangers, or the *profanum vulgus*, should witness an emotion so derogatory to the dignity of an Iddah sovereign. The negotiation resulted, as in the former instance, in a treaty, on which followed the usual presents, and the expedition proceeded.

We then come to the selection of a site for the "model farm," which, forming no part of the objects of the expedition, but engrafted upon it as the adventure of a distinct Society—laudable enough in projection—proved most disastrous in its results, and a sad *incubus* on the main undertaking. The site, extending sixteen miles along the river and about four miles from the bank, was purchased by the Society for 700,000 couries —about 45*l*. It was at this juncture that the difficulties of the expedition became formidable. On the 18th of September the number of sick had increased to sixty, and death had already made fearful ravages among the crews. At this crisis a consultation of the commissioners was held, at which it would seem there was a difference of opinion; Captain Trotter, the senior commissioner, inclining to send all the sick back to the sea in

the *Soudan*, while the other two vessels went on. Commander W. Allen, the only one of the three who had any previous knowledge of the river, took another and so strong a view of the subject that he felt it necessary "to place his opinion upon record: as the river would now begin to fall and the most unhealthy season would commence, he thought it his duty to suggest that, considering the weakened state of the expedition, and the increasing sickness, the decision of the commissioners at their former meeting—namely, to proceed up both rivers—should not be abided by, but that all the steam-vessels should leave the river." This opinion, from motives to which Commander Allen awards the highest praise, was, however, overruled by the senior commissioner, and with the most disastrous results. Matters go on from bad to worse: the chief commissioner and Commander Bird Allen, though they acquiese in the expediency of the *Wilberforce* returning to the sea, determine on the *Albert* prosecuting the objects of the expedition. Commander William Allen again urges his opinion, grounded on his experience, that all the vessels should return; but while he regrets the contrary decision of Captain Trotter and Commander Bird Allen, he expresses his admiration of the "unshaken courage of those gallant officers."

We open the second volume of this interesting narrative at the point at which, the *Wilberforce* returning to the sea, her Commander W. Allen, then in a very weakly state, is about to part from his chief, Captain Trotter:—

"It was doubly painful (Commander W. Allen informs us) to him thus to separate; for, while admiring the generous zeal with which they (his companions) determined on prosecuting the enterprize, he deeply regretted being precluded from the possibility of accompanying them; and he could not stifle the fear and presentiment of its fatal results which were too surely verified. It was the last time he saw poor Bird Allen."

Although our limits warn us of the little space which is left to us, we cannot pass a trait of professional feeling recorded in a passage which has reference to the former expedition under poor Richard Lander. In their passage down the river we are told—

"A melancholy visit was made to the remains of the two vessels, *Quorra* and *Alburkah*, which performed that unsuccessful and fatal voyage. They were lying on the shore in the next cove, called 'Goodrich Bay.' As Captain Allen had passed a whole year in the Niger on board the little *Alburkah*, it was with some degree of painful interest, which a sailor usually feels for a vessel he has long served in, that

he saw the poor little craft lying high and dry on the shore in rapid decay."

On the 17th of November the *Wilberforce* anchored in the Roads of Ascension, the officers and men having providentially recovered their health. On the 5th of January following, intelligence reached them that the *Albert* had been compelled to return to Fernando Po, with all her crew dangerously ill with fever. In addition to this melancholy intelligence, it was rumoured that Mr. Carr, the superintendent of the model farm, had been murdered by the natives at the mouth of the Niger. On the 28th of January despatches from Captain Trotter arrived, in which it was intimated that Commander W. Allen was to consider himself as in command of the expedition and acting chief commissioner. The next incident of painful interest was the appearance of the ill-fated *Albert* emerging from the Nun, whither the *Soudan* had, in the mean time, returned. We give the picture in the words of the book :—

"It was a lovely morning, and the scenery about the river looked very beautiful, affording a sad contrast to the dingy and deserted look of the *Albert*. Many were, of course, the painful surmises as to the fate of those on board. On approaching, however, the melancholy truth was soon told : the fever had been doing its direst work : several were dead—many dying ; and of all the officers but two, Doctors Mac-William and Stranger, were able to move about : the former presented himself and waved his hand ; and one emaciated finger was seen to be raised up for a second. This was Captain Trotter, who, in his anxiety to look at the *Soudan* again, had been lifted out of his cot. A spectacle more full of painful contemplation could scarcely have been witnessed."

In this melancholy picture we find the fulfilment of Commander W. Allen's predictions. Would that his counsel had been better regarded ! And here we may consider the expedition at an end as far as any practical purposes are concerned. Commander W. Allen, in the absence of instructions from England, had determined on another attempt to ascend the Niger; but, before he could put his design into execution, advices from head quarters arrived to stop the further progress of the enterprize. We must refer our readers to the work itself for many interesting particulars, especially commending to their notice a very graphic description of Fernando Po; nor have we space for an account of the mission of the *Wilberforce*, under Lieutenant Webb, to the model farm, for which purpose he re-ascended the river. The result was the final abandonment of that ill-advised establishment, the fate of Mr. Carr, the superintendent being left in doubt, although little hope is enter-

tained of his having survived. We cannot, however, dismiss these volumes from our hands without adverting to the concluding chapter, which is mainly devoted to the consideration of the slave question, but which opens with a perfectly uncalled for apology for, or rather defence of, the officers of the expedition, who, we are told, in the chapter referred to, "found an almost universal impression that they had failed in executing the purposes for which they were sent." The justification of the expedition is only to be found in the purity of the motives in which it originated: its wisdom or expediency is another question, with which the officers to whom it was entrusted have nothing to do. What man could do, or even *dare*, they did. If courage, perseverance, and zeal could have accomplished the purpose for which they were sent, their success would have been triumphant; but the fact of the failure of the expedition entrusted to *such* hands sets at rest, at once and for ever, any further attempt of a like nature. The passage of the Niger, for any practical purpose, is barred against the European by the Angel of Death; and we do not hesitate to say that a repetition of the effort would be nothing less than a "tempting of Providence," so to speak. It is quite impossible to write in terms sufficiently eulogistic of the conduct of every officer of the expedition; and, if we are disposed to regret that the chief commissioner did not yield to the advice of his more experienced second in command, we do not award the less honour to the high and chivalric feeling which prompted his perseverance. We cannot, however, avoid pointing to the fact of the small amount of mortality on board the *Wilberforce*, as compared with that which obtained in the other vessels, as some testimony to the value of *experience*. When we thus pronounce on the settlement of the question, as regards any future effort of the same nature, we do not overlook the fact, put forward in the narrative, that the delay occasioned by "the anxious desire of the promoters of the expedition, that it should be wanting in nothing which might be conducive to the safety of the crews or the furtherance of the great object in view," occasioned the attempt to ascend the Niger to be made at a period unfavourable to the enterprize. Neither do we fail to appreciate the feeling—to which the narrative gives bitter utterance—on the part of a British officer, that they should have been the vehicle of promises to the native chiefs, conditional on their abandonment of the traffic in slaves, which the Government they represented are in no condition to fulfil. We refer to the assurance given by the commissioners, that the English authorities would despatch vessels up the Niger for the purposes of

trading with the people. Let the commissioners console themselves in the reflection on the sincerity and good faith in which those promises were made, and on the fact that their non-fulfilment is in no degree chargeable on any want of zeal, enterprise, or perseverance on their part.

We especially commend to the attention of all, and they are many, who are interested in the subject, the remarks on the slave trade; convinced as we are, from much communication with officers employed to put it down, that the views propounded in the chapter to which we refer are sound, at variance though they be with those of the philanthropists of the day. That a traffic, to which no epithet sufficiently expressive of its enormity can be applied, should be put down by all and every means, we strenuously maintain; but we are as fully convinced that the present system, carried on at an incalculable expense of blood and treasure, only tends to aggravate the suffering it seeks to subdue.

We should be wanting in justice to the authors of the volumes which we reluctantly close did we withhold the tribute of our warmest praise to the clear, manly, straightforward, in a word, sailor-like style, in which they are written; nor must we omit to call attention to the highly graphic and artistical character of the numerous illustrations, on metal and wood, from the pencil of Captain William Allen, whose spirited sketches of Ascension, Fernando Po, and of the Niger (taken at his former visit), as well as his Academy pictures, have already gained for him considerable reputation as an artist.

ART. VI.—*Panslavism and Germanism.* By Count VALERIAN KRASINSKI, author of the "Reformation in Poland." London: Newby. 1848.

"PANSLAVISM (as M. Krasinski observes) is a term which means the union of all the Slavonic nations into one empire or confederation, and is as yet little known in England. It has, however, already produced a strong sensation in Germany, and has been discussed in France." It is much the same with us in respect to any great continental idea as it is with our fashions: we are behind our neighbours—we do not originate and we do not adopt till that which is new to us has ceased to to be a novelty with them. But the very caution of the English character has its advantages. If it renders us slow to receive any thing, the full value of which we have not ascertained, it

also enables us to hold it with tenacity after it is acquired, and makes us skilful in discovering its real uses. Hence, when once we master the meaning of any leading and characteristic term, we are sometimes better able to understand its true signification and more important bearing than those from whom we derive it. The word "Panslavism" expresses an idea which must shortly exercise a very powerful influence in the settlement of the great political questions of the day. It is receiving a striking interpretation at the present moment in the Danubian provinces, and must therefore, before long, engage the thoughts and energies of English writers and statesmen. This is the excuse, apart from the merit of the work itself, which we have for introducing to our readers the subject of which it treats—a subject which at first sight appears so dry, and which has hardly been fairly represented by those* who have professed to understand it. Misled by feeble or tiresome expositions, even intelligent persons have seen in it hitherto nothing but an Urquhart hallucination, and have dismissed it with a sneer at Russophobia. It is not the less a truth, however, because it is within the cognizance of a gentleman who depreciates the value of the information which he really possesses by the tediousness of his parliamentary expositions and the bitterness of his political animosities; and it will soon, from its very importance, command more attention than has already been given to it. We have had occasion to introduce the subject more or less to the notice of our readers in two of our recent *Reviews*, and we are very glad of the opportunity afforded to us, by the timely and able publication before us, of treating the matter more at large.

It is impossible for any thinking man not to perceive that small ideas and petty interests are daily giving place in the policy of States to enlarged notions of unity and comprehensive schemes of general utility. That point in the destiny of nations seems to have been reached where it becomes necessary that the several tribes of which they are composed should resolve themselves into the primary divisions of the great family of man. We have been hitherto accustomed to the idea suggested by the word "nationality;" but are now called, by the mighty events which are daily occurring around us, to understand the larger signification of the word "race." There is an evident impulsive influence upon men to disruption and re-con-

* We must except from this remark Col. Buller, whose work on "The Reaction of the Slavonians," and Ranke's "History of Servia," furnished the matter for the two reviews, to which we, in a few lines lower down than the above paragraph, allude.

stitution—disruption of the bonds which have hitherto held men together, and re-constitution into other forms of society. Newly awakened sympathies which have been dormant for ages, long forgotten associations re-called to remembrance, are proving more powerful than the claims of nationality; and empires are breaking to pieces that the several elements of which they have been composed may be re-formed upon a broader scale and the simpler principles of a common origin, a common language, and common generic characteristics. Two instalments towards the ultimate result of this general tendency are in course of payment. Austria will shortly cease to be an empire through the process of abstraction, and Germany is aiming at a mighty confederation by the absorption of individual kingdoms into the so-called "Vater-land."

It is difficult to account for this tendency so widely manifested, unless we see in it one of those great steps which must be attained in the progression of mankind to its great and final destiny. The taste for antiquity which has so recently sprung up, and the enlarged spheres in which philosophical speculations, both reflective and prospective, are carried on, may be secondary causes, as they are certainly symptoms, of the tendency to which we have alluded; but they will hardly be deemed sufficient to constitute its source. The learned delight to trace out the history of tribes to their origin, and to show the distinctive marks by which the several branches of the family of man, however scattered over the surface of the globe, may be recognised. The philosopher looks to the past progress of the mental and moral characteristics of mankind, classifies and arranges them into theories, and prognosticates their ultimate development. Philanthropists ask for extended regions, and more comprehensive subjects, for the exercise of their benevolence; whilst men of enthusiastic minds endeavour to break up old forms as too narrow for the increasing energies of mankind. In every class there is an aspiration for something more than is possessed, the want of which is felt, but the way to which is not known. These causes combined may account for the fact that the highly intellectual are contemplating in theory the reformation of society on the broader basis of a community of race as both possible and desirable; but they will hardly account for another fact, that what the intellectual hold in theory the unthinking masses are putting into practice. Driven onwards by an impulse which has a deeper source than we can at present fathom, and an ultimate tendency which we cannot predicate, men are tracing out the origin of their existence as tribes, and calling upon all whom

they can recognise as brethren to break the bonds of nationalities which separate them, in deference to the higher claims of a kindred blood, and in order that they may associate on the basis of a generic affinity. We see this in the convulsions that are shaking the States of Christendom to their centre. The German and the Pole, reviving their ancient animosities, stand fiercely apart from each other because one is a Teuton and the other a Slave: the Slave urges the tribes around him, by the ties of common descent, to aid him in his deadly strife with the Magyar: the Dane reminds the Swede of their common Scandinavian origin; and even Irish agitators excite their unhappy countrymen to phrenzy and violence by a constant reference to the distinctive differences between the Celt and the Saxon.

At the present moment the nations of Christendom are not committed to war one with another. How soon such may be the case no one can tell. It would seem to be the time spoken of in the twenty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah:—"*Thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me: Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it, and they shall drink and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them.....and it shall be if they refuse to take the cup at thine hand to drink, then shalt thou say unto them,* YE SHALL CERTAINLY DRINK." The enumeration of nations in this prophecy is very striking, and the manner in which it is receiving its fulfilment too remarkable to escape the observation of those who have an intelligent faith in the Scriptures as the word of God. The cup has been repeatedly offered and refused with loathing: again, it is presented to the lips of the nations—it remains to be seen whether it will again be refused. The nations of Europe have been many times on the eve of a general conflict, yet by mutual consent they have shrunk from the catastrophe. Causes of offence on every hand have existed, one tithe of which would in former times have set the world in a flame; yet they have been set aside by sacrifices of such a nature as testified at once to the imminence of the crisis and the reluctance to precipitate. There have been "wars and rumours of wars"—partial and sanguinary conflicts hastily terminated, to be succeeded by fresh alarms and terrible suspense; but the hour must come—it cannot be finally avoided—it is only postponed. The cup is in the trembling hand—terror and dread are in the heart—and the moment is awaited in deep anxiety when it must be drained to the dregs. Though, however, there is a general apprehension, there is for the time being a doubtful peace. We have just so much respite as will enable us to speculate on the quarter from whence the evil will come.

With the exception of the unprincipled attack of Sardinia upon Austria, and the equally unprincipled assault of Germany upon Denmark, the sanguinary struggles which have taken place have been hitherto between rulers and subjects. They will probably henceforth be generally between nation and nation, and arise from such causes as will defy a speedy accommodation. The elements of a formidable warfare between opposing races are collecting together, and the certainty of the outbreak is but a question of time. A battle-cry is at this moment heard in Hungary, which will probably ere long wake a responsive echo in each of the leading nations of the continent. The flame that is flickering in the Danubian provinces will find materials in the Slavonian ramifications of the northern dynasties, and become a conflagration threatening the peace of the world. The attitude of every greater State is that of painful and expectant watchfulness: the question is not so much, will any blow be struck, as who will first strike it? Russia is merely waiting for a fitting opportunity: Germany is preparing for the conflict: France is only restrained by the energy of one man, to whom her miserable dissensions have given a transitory authority; whilst reluctant and peace-loving England, hardly daring to hope that she can stand neutral in the general strife, looks out with nervous apprehension for the quarter from whence it shall arise. To use the language of the world, we are at the mercy of an accident. A single false step may precipitate the general calamity, and against this we have no safeguard but the common necessity of refraining from it. This is but a sorry guarantee when we remember that the passions of men are so much stronger than their principles—a truth which has received of late some very fearful demonstrations. A forward movement on the part of Russia, and Germany must take arms: an act of treachery on the part of Charles Albert, and Austria will advance; in either case France, eager for action, will enter on the field; and England, trammelled with treaties, unless she gives them and her honour to the wind, will find herself compelled to listen to the cry for help which one or other of the combatants will address to her.

If the calamity of war be happily delayed, we can hardly hope that it will be ultimately avoided. Even if the Italian question is capable of a peaceful solution, which is very doubtful—seeing that the claims of a conqueror, the notorious treachery of a defeated monarch, and the impracticability of a boastful and turbulent population have to be adjusted into such a treaty as shall satisfy all—there are the proverbial restlessness of France and the threatening nature to existing dynasties of the Pansla-

vic movement; and nothing that we can hear or read furnishes us with good ground for hope that the one is innocuous and that the other may be easily subdued. We have not that faith in the peace-preserving policy of General Cavaignac which some manifest; not that we doubt the sincerity of the General: he is by far the most honest of the men whom the wild commotions of intestine strife have thrown to the surface of French affairs; but we doubt his power: he is necessary for the moment, because the turbulent and selfish shopkeepers of Paris have discovered that Socialism is not exactly consistent with their interests; and he is the only one who has been sufficiently sincere to speak what he thinks, and is sufficiently decided to execute what he has promised. But the French mind is as uncertain as the weathercock: no one can predicate what its aspect will be for two days together. When the fear of Socialism subsides, respect for the authority of the General will abate. He can only retain his place either as a military dictator or as the servant of the Republic: in the first case, the basis of his power will be the army; in the second, he will hold his authority by the sufferance of the people. A peace system will never secure him the affections of 500,000 armed men, whose trade is war and whose only hopes of advancement are derived from the chances which it offers; whilst a restless people, whose vanity is inordinate, whose foreign policy is ever aggressive, and whose traditional associations have always a reference to the glories of conquest, will no sooner perceive the opportunities of internal strife denied to them than they will desire a legitimate field for the exercise of their warlike energies. This field the first servant of the Republic will have to find. The nation will account it the paramount duty of his office, and he will discover that it is as necessary to the honour of his country as to his own interest. It is not, however, impossible that, under every circumstance, General Cavaignac will maintain his pacific view: still the probabilities of war will not be the less, for in that case he is sure to fall, and this he seems himself to anticipate. Whoever succeeds him will have to win and hold his position by a deference to the general wish, which if it be not that of the most intelligent, is at least that of the most turbulent and powerful party in the country. Mr. Disraeli recently endeavoured to demonstrate that it was impossible for France to go to war, as she had neither men nor means. We think that the eminent speaker, in the instance alluded to, lacked his usual sagacity. France has at the present moment upwards of half a million of men in uniform, besides the National Guard, and a complete war materiel. As for the means, her policy is to fix the expense

of her warfare on the States which she aids or conquers. Neither do we think with him that the army cannot be removed without the certainty of socialistic insurrections. Once let it be proclaimed throughout the land that the honour of France lies a bleeding—that her enemies have insulted her and that she needs avenging—there will be magic enough in these words to bow down every minor interest before the irresistible impulses of the national vanity. The *amour propre* of a Frenchman is stronger as a sentiment than his philanthropy is as a principle; and whatever may be the amount of his desire for the regeneration of the society in which he moves, the sense of a personal insult is greater. What is true of the individual is true of the nation. The *philosophy* of Socialism would soon be forgotten in the absorbing determination to maintain the national character. As to socialistic *ruffianism*, that might be disposed of in another way. Let it be drafted into the army to find on the field of carnage a fitting sphere for the exercise of its ferocious propensities; and, whatever the enemies of France might suffer, she herself would enjoy for the time an immunity from civil conflict. In not very dissimilar circumstances, this was the course pursued by M. Roland, who turned the refuse of his countrymen into soldiers, and "marched them as far as their legs would carry them, lest they should unexpectedly return and cut the throats of their fellow-citizens."

It has been said that France has learned wisdom and magnanimity by the sufferings which she has endured, and that we have a guarantee for the peace of Europe in the ascendancy which enlightened men have gained in her counsels. These ideas have no better foundation than in the dreaming of two or three Manchester delegates, who, deeming that there is nothing so important to the world as the manufacture of cotton and an available market for its sale, would feign believe that everybody else must think as they do: they imagine that enlightenment and civilisation keep exact pace with the amount of manufactured production, and cannot, therefore, conceive the possibility of men's being urged to action by more powerful motives than the love of gain, or by deeper passions than the excitement of competition. Such, however, is the fact: there are fiercer elements in France than the small and selfish policy of free trade legislators can comprehend or meet: something more is needed to the perfection of that universal civilisation, which can alone secure the peace of the world, than the theories of barter, however enlarged, can furnish. The aspirations of human nature are not to be satisfied by a condition of commercial prosperity, nor will the restless desire for action amongst such a

people as the French be exhausted in the pursuits of peaceful enterprize. As to the enlightenment of French statesmen, how stands the fact? The advent of M. de Lamartine to power was hailed by the advocates of social progress as a great step gained. It was a proof of present success and a sure ground of promise for the future. He was, it was said, a poet—a man of enlarged ideas—free from the prejudices of caste or sect. It is certain that he was easy on the score of creeds—a sublime declaimer on faith as a sentiment—not very much troubled in religion with anything beyond its poetry—and not overburthened with puritanism in its practice. What more was needed? There was also M. Cremieux, the oracle of Mr. Cobden: there were, besides, historians and *litterateurs*—the representatives of intellectual nobility and mental civilisation. The journals of our own country were as loud in their encomiums as they are now profuse in their condemnation: according to them, at that time, the French Ministry of February was a miracle of wisdom, moderation, and sagacity. It happened, however, that these enlightened men had, after all, some of the failings of poor humanity: so they quarrelled about the division of the spoil, and then, as is always the case when rogues fall out, honest men heard the truth. Lamartine was found to have a small touch of vanity, which made him treacherous in his foreign policy and befooled him into being the tool of his sharper brethren. Cremieux was proved to have more of the Jew than the name; and the *litterateurs* had certain pleasant theories of social regeneration which could only be put into practice by a process of wholesale and national phlebotomy. Lamartine was for a time the idol of France and the delight of the modern *illuminati* of every clime: a few days ago, he could only command two votes out of the nine hundred of the National Assembly. It might be thought that this fact afforded a proof of something like returning good sense and courage amongst so important a body of men. We fear no such conclusion can be drawn; for this very Assembly in a few days afterwards, unable to resist the evidence of truth, condemned certain of their number to the infamy of public opinion; but, too cowardly to be honest, only accused them of the lesser of the two crimes with which they were charged. Not to be behind hand, the Executive allowed the parties charged to escape; and thus, whilst the Socialist workmen who fought and murdered in the maintenance of their principles, are condemned, transported, or sent to the galleys, the men, who paid them for the crime and preached them into its commission go scot free. There is no enlightenment here—no such disinterestedness and honesty of purpose—no such nobi-

lity in any one of the actors in these scenes as shall constitute a guarantee for the peace of the world. The National Assembly cannot be depended upon either for sound sense, consistency, or stability; and yet upon the amount of these, as possessed by this body, do the destinies of France and of Europe at present depend. "The country still bleeds from the wound of Waterloo: do not be lulled by the word of England: go to Italy that spreads out her arms: strike a bold blow: *elevate the people of France in the eyes of Europe, and the people of France will love you.*" Such is the language of the *Reforme* at the very moment in which we are writing. France has attained no further in her progress towards an enlightened civilisation than the overweening desire for elevation in the eyes of Europe; and this must be accomplished at any cost, even though in reaching it she pass over the mangled corpses of every nationality which she meets with in her way.

But let it be granted that, under every circumstance, France is content, in deference to a nobler sentiment, to forego her national traditions and to repress her national tendencies. Let us suppose the Italian question settled to her satisfaction without an armed intervention—that, in short, Europe has nothing whatever to fear from French propagandism or French ambition—there is yet the Panslavic movement to which we have already alluded, which must ultimately force the northern powers into action; for it must come in contact with a similar movement to which it is opposed—we mean Germanism.

The great idea of Germanism is one united fatherland: it has its Parliament at Frankfort, at once the fruit and the expression of this idea: that of the Slavonians is the gathering together of the several branches of the race into one confederation. The two ideas, though alike in character, lead to antagonistic results: when, therefore, the Germans called upon the Slavonians to send deputies to Frankfort they refused, and constituted a purely Slavic Congress for themselves at Prague. This Congress was broken up by the bombardment of that city —a matter which as yet is not very well explained. The existence of these two Parliaments is, however, a striking fact in these days: it shows the force and influence of the two ideas of Panslavism and Germanism in leading men to merge the distinctions of nationality in the absorbing affinities of race.

According to Szaffarik, whom Count Krasinski quotes, the Slavonic populations number in the aggregate nearly eighty millions; and these are chiefly under the rule of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Turkey. Russia is almost entirely Slavonic, fifty-four millions of her subjects being of Slavonic origin.

The Austrian population is made up of Slaves, Germans, Magyars, and Wallachians: of these the Slaves are nearly seventeen millions, the Germans are under seven millions, and the Magyars and Wallachians together nearly seven millions more. There are, besides, her Italian subjects. Prussia owns amongst her subjects two millions of Slavonians, and Turkey six. Any general movement, Panslavic in its origin and objects, must, it is clear, convulse every one of these States: either the Slavonians will form a distinct and independent confederacy, or they will become the subjects of the power which possesses the greatest facility and energy for forming them into one vast empire. Russia, by her position and resources, is the most fitted to effect this object: she possesses an incentive to attempt it, inasmuch as success would aid her in accomplishing the traditional ambitions of her dynasty for eastern conquest; and she has an important element toward the attainment of success in the fact that the staple of her constitution as an empire is already Slavic in its origin, Slavic in its sympathies, and Slavic in its material. The obstacle in her path is Poland; but this obstacle she will, we think, ultimately overcome. There are significant symptoms of a disposition on the part of some enlightened Poles to forget the wrongs which they have suffered at the hand of the Autocrat if he will aid them, though under his rule, in assuming a position as an important element in the constitution of a great Slavonic confederacy. There is, moreover, as we think, evidence of a policy on the part of Russia tending to such a result. The attempts of Russia to destroy the nationality of Poland have arisen from her desire to force the latter into a subservient position as part of a race. This, if we mistake not, was the policy which induced the Empress Catherine to meditate the partition of Poland, and has influenced the Emperor Nicholas in his constant endeavour to constitute her a Russian province. The course pursued by Russia towards Poland has very naturally led to great cruelty and tyranny on the one hand, and to much exasperation on the other: we do not, therefore, wonder that M. Krasinski, who feels and writes like a Pole, full of love for his native land and not without hope for the destinies of his unhappy country, should write bitterly of the Russian rule; but whilst demonstrating the fact of a Panslavic movement, and the fierce hostility of Slave against Teuton, as of two races that cannot be reconciled, he strangely enough advocates the elevation of Poland into a kingdom as part of a Slavonic confederacy under the rule of Austria, and considers this to be the surest defence of Europe against Russian encroachment. If the Panslavic movement towards

one grand confederation as a race—if the irreconcileable hostility of Slave to German be facts—then the erection of one portion of the Slavonic race into a distinct kingdom would not be commensurate to the ultimate tendency of this movement; nor would it be feasible. The result of this movement must be to destroy distinct nationalities amongst the Slavic tribes, or it is no movement at all—such as is it described. To bring them under the domination of German rulers would only be to act over again a policy which our author would seem to say is *effete*. The whole object of the work before us is to present Panslavism and Germanism as two distinct movements hostile to each other, which must sooner or later come into violent collision; and, whilst we fully agree with the author as to the fact, we are quite sure that the policy which he advocates is inconsistent with the very existence of the fact. We do not see how Austria can cease to become an integral part of the Germanic Confederation: she can never separate herself from the Germanism of her policy, and, until she does so, cannot become the head of a Slavonic movement. It is much more likely that Austria, by the abstraction of the Slavonic populations from her rule, must shortly cease to be an empire, and that this is a result which Russia both desires and secretly works for.

The idea of Panslavism is originally of intellectual and literary origin:—

"The rapid progress of intellectual development in Europe since the beginning of this century exerted its influence upon the Slavonic nations also: literature has been steadily advancing, and all branches of human knowledge have been successfully cultivated by those nations. The principal subjects, however, that have engaged the attention of Slavonic scholars are the history and antiquities of their respective countries, studied not only in their written records, but also in their popular songs, traditions, and superstitions, together with the cultivation and improvement of their natural languages. Such studies could not, however, lead to any satisfactory result as long as they were confined to the student's own country; and it was soon found indispensable to extend them to other Slavonic nations. The result was the universal conviction that all the Slavonic nations are not only so many offsets of the same common stock, and that their respective idioms are not only so many dialects of the same mother tongue, but also that the most important parts of their moral and physical character are identical. In short, that all the Slavonians, notwithstanding the various modifications resulting from the influence of different climates, religions, and forms of Government are, in all their essentials, one and the same nation. This conviction could not but expand the love of the native land which animated the above-mentioned students into that of their whole race, and they promoted by their writings this feeling amongst their countrymen."

The great idea of the Slavonic writers thenceforth became that of a literary brotherhood throughout the several divisions of the race. The Bohemian *literati* took the lead. The national literature of Bohemia was formerly confined to a limited class of readers, and met with powerful competition in the productions of the German press, which almost exclusively secured the attention of educated persons. Slavonic writers needed a wider sphere, both as an incentive and a source of reward; and it was accordingly determined by the Bohemian authors to "extend the intellectual activity of every Slavonic nation over the whole of their race, instead of limiting it, as had hitherto been the case, to their peculiar branch."

This idea was first brought forward in a tangible and practical form by Kollar, a Protestant clergyman of the Slavonic congregation at Pesth, in Hungary: he embodied it in several of his writings, and more particularly prepared it in a dissertation, which he published in German, in order that it might find a readier access to the educated classes of the Slavonic nations. This work appeared in 1828, and was entitled "Wechselseitichkeit," or *reciprocity*. He proposed that "every educated Slavonian should be conversant with the languages and literature of the principal branches of the common stock, and that the Slavonic *literati* should possess a thorough knowledge of all the dialects and sub-dialects of their race: he reasoned analogically that, as the different dialects of ancient Greece did not hinder the works of those authors who wrote in them from becoming the common property and glory of all Greece, so that the difference of dialects distinguishing the Slavonic tribes would not prevent a Slavonic reputation, general throughout the tribes, from attaching to any author who should write in the dialect peculiar to any portion of them. Kollar was followed by Szaffarik, who published a sketch of all the Slavonian languages and their literature, and who, by his works on Slavonic history and statistics, has acquired an European reputation:—

"Kollar's proposition, supported by Szaffarik's book, found a ready echo amongst the scholars of all the Slavonic nations: it was a seed which fell upon a ground well prepared for its reception by the Slavonic studies, to which allusion has been made, and it bore abundant fruit. The study of cognate languages and their literature becomes daily more and more general amongst all the Slavonic nations; and already, at this moment, few, if any, Slavonic writers of any merit are unacquainted with the languages and literature of the sister branches of their common race."

Such, says our author, is the origin of Panslavism. We question, however, if that which he accounts a cause was not in itself rather the symptom of a pre-existent influence. Be

this as it may, the movement, which was at first of an intellectual character, became in time political. It has now assumed an importance upon which many a Slavonian is building the highest hopes, and to the consequences of which many a German is looking forward with fear and apprehension.

The origin of the word "Slave" is somewhat questionable. Some have supposed that it is the word which simply designates "a captive," and that with this signification it was indiscriminately applied to the several tribes, which, in the irruptions of Attila and other barbaric conquerors, were reduced to servitude. The opinion would seem to be more ingenious than correct. De Jordan, who wrote on the Slavonic tribes, and published his work in 1745, derives the word from *Slava*—*i. e.*, *laus gloria*—a word of familiar use in the different dialects and parts of speech and forming the termination of the most illustrious names. Gibbon, who quotes the authority of Jordan and inclines to it, says that "the national appellation of the Slaves has been degraded, by chance or malice, from the signification of glory to that of servitude:" he adds that this conversion of a national into an appellative name must be laid at the door of the princes and bishops of Oriental France, who, in the eighth century, finding themselves rich in Slavonian captives, retained the name which nationally distinguished them, but gave to it a different interpretation. In the same manner, the Σέρβλοι, or "*Sirbs*," by which the Servians were anciently designated, became the Latin "*Servi*" of modern times.

In regard to the origin of the Slavonians, as a race, it is very difficult to extract the truth from the tangled web of conjecture and evidence mingled together in the researches that have been made into their earliest history. They are mentioned by Herodotus as supplying the Greeks with amber from the shores of the Baltic: they are severally spoken of by Pliny, Ptolemy, and Procopius. It is, therefore, evident that their existence as a distinct people in Europe must be traced to a very early period. It seems clear to some that they formed part of the tribes which, in the first ages of the world's history, originated from the high lands of central Asia. It has been argued by others,* who admit their origin to be Asiatic, that they came from India. The language is said to bear a close resemblance to the Sanscrit, and, indeed, to be a dialect of it; whilst in the idolatry of the Slavonians, the prominent features of Hindoo mythology are to be recognized. Thus Brama, Vishnu, and Seva, were represented by the Slavonian Perun, Volos, and Koleda. They held with the Hindoos the doctrine of the im-

* "Buller's Reaction of the Slavonians."

mortality and transmigration of the soul, and practised the *Suttee*, or burning the widow on the funeral pile of her husband. The Eastern Slavonians worshipped the three gods above-named, and the people in many parts of Russia and Poland to this day designate Christians by the word "*Koleda*," because the festival of that god was anciently celebrated on the 24th of December. The Slavonians of the Baltic acknowledged two principles—one good and the other evil; and they worshipped, besides the gods already mentioned, Porenut, whose idol had four faces and a fifth on his breast—supposed to have been the god of the seasons; Porevit, represented with five hands; and Rughevit, supposed to be the god of war, whose idol had seven faces, seven swords suspended at his side, and an eighth in his hand. It is a significant fact that the figure of a beetle is found on many of the ancient Slavonian idols; and this will afford ground for entertaining the theory of an Egyptian origin to those who remember the veneration anciently paid to the scarabæus by the Egyptians.

In the order of succession in their arrival in Europe, the Celts probably preceded the Slavonians, and the Slavonians the Teutons. The northern and north-eastern parts of Europe were occupied by the *Tshuds*—a race belonging to the Asiatic variety of the human species—and these were found in possession when the Slavonians migrated to Europe. They drove them further northward, and, settling in the conquered territory for a time, were, in their turn, driven before the Teutons. Thus, the animosity existing between the Slaves and the Teutons dates from a very early period; and it is a remarkable fact that, co-existent with the re-animation of the mutual sympathies uniting the Slavonic nations into one race, is also the revival into fierce antagonism of the ancient antipathy of the Slave against the German. This, however, is hardly to be wondered at, as one natural consequence of the study of Slavonic history would be a knowledge of its facts, and these are made up chiefly of the triumphs of the hardier Teutons over their weaker brethren, and the usual results of victory amongst barbaric nations—oppression and insult on the part of conqueror towards the conquered. Besides the written page of the history for the study of the learned, there is also a book which the masses of the Slavonians, in common with the unlettered of every nation, find it easier to read: and that is the book of traditional remembrance, where the relation of wrongs is traced in characters too deeply engraven to be easily effaced, and where the aspiration for vengeance survives the decaying influence of time. For this book, unhappily, there are ample ma-

terials in the record which has been handed from father to son of Teutonic cruelties and oppression. M. Krasinski quotes the authority of Herder, a German historian, in testimony of Slavonian suffering. This writer says:—

"These aggressive wars upon the Slavonians began under Charlemagne: commercial advantages were their evident cause, although the Christian religion was used as a pretence; because, certainly, it was found more convenient for the heroic Franks to treat as slaves an industrious nation, which exercised agriculture and commerce, than themselves to learn and to exercise these arts. What the Franks had begun was completed by the Saxons. The Slavonians were either exterminated or reduced to bondage by whole provinces, and their lands were divided amongst bishops and nobles: their commerce on the Baltic was destroyed by the northern Germans. Vineta came to a melancholy end through the Danes, and their remnants in Germany are in a state resembling that to which the Spaniards reduced the Peruvians. Is it, therefore, a wonder that, after centuries of subjection and the deepest exasperation of that people against their Christian masters and robbers, their mild character should have degenerated into a cruel, cunning, slavish indolence? And yet their ancient character is everywhere distinguishable, and particularly wherever they enjoy some degree of liberty."

Herder wrote eighty years ago; and, whilst Count Krasinski thankfully avails himself of such a testimony from a German, he thinks it right to correct the character here given of the modern Slavonians by a passage in their favour from a more recent writer, also a German, Karl Preusker; and he reasons from this passage that Herder must have formed his estimate on incorrect data; or that the progress of civilisation, in ameliorating the causes, has also abstracted the characteristics of Slavonian degradation. The real condition of the Slavonian character is, however, a very important element in accounting for the present hostility of the Germans; and we are not ourselves satisfied that the favourable estimate which the count would leave on the minds of his readers will entirely be borne out by facts.

The systematic persecution of the Slavonians by the Germans seems to have continued for a long time after their final subjugation. Our author quotes one or two proofs drawn from official documents:—"Meinhard, Bishop of Halberstadt, ordered, in 1246, that the Slavonic inhabitants of several places belonging to the convent of Bistorf should, in case they would not abandon some of what he calls their Pagan customs, be expelled and replaced by German good Catholics. Szaffarik quotes the deed of sale of a village, called 'Veliz,' where it is said, '*Velimus et debeamus omnes Slavos et cives eandem villam*

inhabitantes eliminare sine omni spe reversionis.' The Bishop of Breslau ordered, in 1495, that all the Polish peasants of a place, called 'Woitz,' should in two years learn German or be expelled." And he also adds, on the authority of the "*Chronican Slavorum*," that, "long after the establishment of the Christian religion, whenever a Slavonian was met on the high road and could not give what was considered a satisfactory account for his absenting himself from his village, he was executed on the spot or killed like a wild beast."

These are instances which are, no doubt, types of a class of facts, and will easily account for the antipathy of the conquered towards their conquerors. But still, we think that something more than the mere insolence and excess of power is necessary to account for the antipathy of the Germans to the Slaves. The retaliations exercised by the Slavonians towards their masters have sometimes been very terrible; and, if one tithe of the accounts which we have received be true, there is still an element of revolting cruelty manifested in the outrages of Gallicia and Posen, no matter by whom provoked, which renders the modern Slavonians not one whit behind their Bohemian ancestors. The fanatical spirits of John Ziskas, Taborites, Horebites, and Adamites, would seem to be acted over again in the deeds of their descendants. It is singular, too, that all the atrocities with which the Austrian army is charged in Italy are invariably alleged to have been committed by the Croats in the service of the emperor. This goes far to show that there is something in the Slavonian constitution which justifies the accusation brought against the race generally by the Germans.

The count, in proof of German intolerance, quotes at length from an article written by a M. Wuttke, a German writer of the liberal party, and a deputy to the German Parliament at Frankfort: the title of the article is "*Polen und Deutsche.*" This article certainly exhibits a good amount of German hatred on the part of one who is the member of a Parliament of professedly grand ideas and enlarged philanthropies; and it well merits the keen but quiet gentlemanly comment passed upon it by M. Krasinski. Still, it appears to us but as one of the trumpet-sounds echoed from the side of the other party, and a natural consequence of the antagonistic interests which are at issue. A great deal of very angry feeling evidently exists amongst the partizans of either movement; and, whilst M. Wuttke's production promises but very little for his wisdom and moderation as a legislator, it is just such as a thorough German, *vis a vis* of the Polish question, might be expected to write.

But Panslavism and Germanism are not movements which only owe their origin to the antagonistic feelings of two great parties. We believe them, on the contrary, to be contemporaneous results of a tendency of the age, operating upon mankind at large. The mutual antipathies involved in these movements is rather a characteristic than a cause—a concomitant of the idea contained in these distinctive words—which, as the idea itself revives, naturally awakens into vigorous life. These two words, "*Panslavism*" and "*Germanism*," are something more than scholastic terms distinguishing particular forms of thought—they express two great political facts. The ideas contained in them are already embodied in action, and no one can as yet predicate what ultimate development they may receive. There is more of political and intellectual theorising in the Parliament at Frankfort, and more of positive reality in the assault of the Slavonians upon the Magyars: still, both must lead to important results, because the several States of Germany, having consented to the idea of a fatherland, must unite in giving "Germanism" a practical exposition and a full development, and because the struggle between the Slavonians and Magyars must ultimately involve the greater nations in its settlement.

There are two countries in which the Panslavic element has come into serious action—in Posen and in Hungary. In the former country it is in direct opposition to Germanism. In the latter, the attack of the Slavonians, whilst it is corroborative of the Panslavic idea as a fact, is not properly directed against the Germans, but against the Magyars, or pure Hungarians. These are a people of Asiatic origin, like in this respect to the Sclavonians, but distinct from them in others, and of more recent existence in Europe. Hungary, however, though an independent kingdom, is part of the empire of Austria: it seems clear, therefore, that sooner or later Austria must take up the quarrel, and, as part of the new German Confederation, bring the opposing elements of Panslavism and Germanism into collision in another form.

The late unhappy events in Posen may in part be traced to the long dormant, but recently awakened, hostility of the two races. Posen is a duchy, forming a Polish province of Prussia, first allotted to that power in the partition of Poland, and confirmed to her by the treaty of Vienna in 1815; it contains a population of about 900,000 Poles, and 100,000 Germans, the Poles being in the proportion of three to one to the Germans. The leading idea of the Polish patriots is the resuscitation of their national independence. They have, therefore,

looked with anxiety upon every continental event likely to produce this result, and very naturally hailed the French Revolutions of 1830, and of February last, as the sure forerunners of their coming freedom. They were destined, in the first instance, to be miserably deceived: what the second may ultimately effect for them is yet a problem. With nothing but their dependence upon French sympathy and their own imperishable valour, they organised a badly planned and desperate insurrection in 1830 against Russia, which failed, as all the world knows, from the want of material and of concert, and from the sheer exhaustion of wasted strength. They were sustained for a time by the hope of European assistance, and by the well-known declaration of Louis Philippe to his chambers in 1831—"*Que la nationalité Polonaise ne perira pas;*" but Poland was one of the victims of that crafty policy then predominant in Paris, which raised many a hope when its existence was necessary to a plan, and relentlessly frustrated it when its realisation became unprofitable. The real sentiments of the then French Government, as M. Krasinski observes, "were soon after rendered manifest by that celebrated phrase—'*L'ordre regne a Varsovie*,' with which Count Sebastiani, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, announced to the Chamber of Deputies 'the fall of Warsaw.'"

The events of February in Paris were followed by similar movements in Berlin: the people, everywhere triumphant, were rendered generous in the joy which their fancied liberty engendered. They were suddenly seized with a sympathetic zeal for the liberation of all who were in bondage, and contemplated propagandist missions throughout the world. Again the poor Poles looked up. The beloved vision once more brightened into an appearance of reality; and Prince Czartoriski, deceived for the moment, left Paris, to bring the so-much-wished and wept-for national existence into life and action: he returned, it is said, with the bitter conviction of the utter impracticability of the attempt. When the news of the Berlin insurrection arrived in Posen, the Poles, as might naturally be supposed, put themselves in motion. The Germans were paralised—the Polish nobles formed themselves into a Provisional Government, and took steps for the formation of an army. They sent a deputation to Berlin to petition for "a national administration, a separate Polish army, national courts of justice, schools and institutions, for the full development of the national element." The king, in deference to the wish of his people in Berlin, listened to the prayer of the deputation, conceded the terms of the petition, and assured the Posen

deputies that he had decided to put himself at the head of his German and Polish subjects and declare war against Russia: he further commenced a movement in the desired direction by resolving upon a national, civil, and military organisation of his Polish duchy at Posen; and General Willisen was sent to accomplish his project. But the wish of the Berlin revolutionists was not the wish of the German residents in Posen: they quickly recovered from their panic, and the general nearly lost his life in the furious opposition which he met with from them. In the mean while, two serious elements of strife had arisen in Posen. On the one hand, the Prussian troops, driven from the capital, exasperated by defeat and breathing vengeance against all promoters and upholders of revolutionary movements, had concentrated in the duchy; and on the other, the peasants, excited by the events in Berlin, had anticipated the object which was contemplated by the king, and had possessed themselves of arms: they had been promised that they should be organised as a national militia, and had eagerly furnished themselves with weapons that they might be ready for the movement. In a little time came the re-action: the king found himself strong enough to disregard the promises he had made in deference to popular intimidation: the Berliners became indifferent to Polish nationality, especially when they had to find the material and to bear the expense: the Germans of Posen were decidedly hostile to it; and the result was, an order for the disarming of the peasantry and the annexation of a portion of the duchy to the German Confederation. In this portion was included the town of Posen itself—the cradle of Polish history and the burial place of Poland's first Christian monarchs. Excesses ensued: the Poles were attacked, particularly the clergy, and one of the latter was murdered by the Germans. It is hardly to be wondered at that the Polish peasantry, thus deceived, refused to lay down their arms, and that sanguinary collisions between them and the troops were the consequence. The conflict was the more terrible, as to the natural antagonism of the two principles for which they severally fought was added the deadly animosity of the two races. Prussia is reaping the fruit of her double dealing: the king has lost the affection of his Polish subjects for ever; and the Sclavonic element has received a development which will become daily more formidable. In the partition of Poland, Prussia played a very perfidious and treacherous part. She will now find in the hostility of her Polish subjects, thus provoked by herself, another of those instances of moral retribution with which the history of the world abounds.

The *Times*, on the authority of the German press, was full of the recitals of horrible cruelties practised by these Polish peasants. M. Krasinski admits the charge to a limited extent, and deplores that excesses should have been committed; but he meets the accusation with a counter-statement of military atrocities on the part of the Prussians. "The *Gazette* of Posen relates with praise how General Hirschfeldt—(whom all Poles unanimously designate as their *executioner*, and at whose feet a captain of his own troops has thrown down his sword, because there was no longer honour in commanding soldiers who were but a band of robbers and assassins)—had drawn forth the peasants from their forest hiding-places, in order to mow them down with shrapnell shot." The count also gives an account of the destruction of the chateau and village of Rogalin by the troops—an account confirmed in a letter to him from the lady to whom the chateau belonged.

We have before us a little pamphlet, entitled "A Narrative of Recent Occurrences in Posen." The object of it is to disprove the charge of cruelty brought against the Poles and to turn it against the Prussians. Prince Czartoriski, the Archbishop of Posen, General Willisen, and Fischer, one of the highest functionaries in the duchy, are quoted on the one side: private letters from persons on the spot are quoted on the other. Willisen and Fischer are both Germans. Prince Czartoriski says, "The balance of moderation was this time on the part of the Poles." General Willesen, alluding to the reports of Polish atrocity, which first put him into a hostile attitude, writes that he had discovered that "he was surrounded by an enormous fabric of lies and stratagems." The "Narrative" is valuable as far as it goes, inasmuch as it presents us with a relation of facts; but it hardly goes far enough, and proves, as we think, a little too much for the object of the writer; for it is hard to suppose that such an amount of brutal ferocity, as is here laid to the account of the Prussian troops, was altogether unprovoked, or, at least, altogether unrevenged. The facts stated by the *Times* were distinctly related—names, times, and places were given: if not true, the statements are susceptible of a particular refutation: no such refutation is attempted. In this respect, the "Narrative" is a failure, and the probability remains that the amount of cruelty was pretty equally balanced on either side. An army of peasants, armed with *scythes*, does not promise, at the first blush, either moderation or mercy.

As we have alluded to the Slavonic movement in Posen, it may not be amiss to make a passing remark on that in Hun-

gary, for it may yet be, to some of our readers, somewhat of a mystery. It seems that the kingdom of Hungary Proper is composed, according to Szaffarik, of about 3,500,000 Magyars or real Hungarians, and about 6,342,000 Slavonians. There are besides of Germans and Wallachians about 2,000,000. The Magyars, having arrived from the countries about the Ouralian mountains in the tenth century, conquered the Slavonic State of Moravia, and the Dacian lands occupied by Slavonians and Wallahs. Subsequently, the frontiers of Hungary were extended by the annexation of the Slavonian kingdom of Croatia. Thus, the kingdom of Hungary is composed of Magyars, Slavonians, Wallaks, and a small proportion of Germans: of these the Slavonians are by far the most numerous.

At an early period, in order to meet the difficulties arising from the use of so many different dialects, the Latin language was adopted for all the official transactions of Hungary. This was a wise measure and fraught with most beneficial results: it would have been well for Hungary if the policy which dictated it had preserved its influence; but the Magyars, desirous of a complete ascendancy, entertained the idea of replacing the use of the Latin tongue by that of their own. After several efforts they succeeded, in 1844, in securing the imperial assent to certain resolutions of the Hungarian Diet, by which the Magyar language was to become the official language of the country, the language of the public schools, and of the deliberations of the Diet. These were met by counter-resolutions on the part of the Slavonians, who determined on their side to substitute the Slavonic for the Latin. The national or Slavonian party, composed of the young, the ardent, and the educated, strove to promote the movement in favour of their mother tongue by literary efforts: the clergy of all kinds joined them, lending their powerful influence in aid; and, finally, the masses took up arms. The Diet of Croatia has already declared itself independent of Hungary; the Croatians have been joined by the Servians; and these together are in hostile attitude before the Magyars and the Germans. The latest accounts placed the Ban of Croatia, sellachich, who is likely to become famous in the history of these troublesome times, at the head of eighty thousand Slavonians. One thing is clear from these facts, that the same affinities and influences of race, which are setting the Poles of Posen in battle array against the Germans, are equally banding the Slavonians of the Danube into one common confederacy against the Hungarians.

We have already alluded to the present distribution of the Slavonian populations. Of the three powerful States, Austria,

Prussia, and Turkey, Austria is the most rife with the Slavonian element; yet this element has ramifications which extend to the heart of each: any attempt to form the several branches of the Slavonic race into one confederacy must, therefore, be attended with convulsive throes highly dangerous, if not fatal, to the political constitution of these powers. Granting that Panslavism is a fact, a very important question is evolved from this consideration. What are the best means of giving such a direction to this movement as shall most consist with the interests of Europe and the maintenance of peace? We have noticed, in general terms, the proposal of M. Krasinski in answer to this question. We will now refer to it more at length. The count says:—

"We think that the wisest and best policy, as well as the most advantageous, for the interests of Germany in particular, as well as for those of Western Europe in general, is, not to arrest the political development of the Western Slavonians, but to promote it by all possible means, in order to form a great Slavonic Confederate State, comprehending Poland and the Slavonians of the Austrian empire, as well as the Hungarians and Wallachians; each country enjoying the fullest development of its nationality, but all united under the same sovereign. Such a political combination is not only based upon the nature of things, but its feasibility is proved by history; and this, we think, is the only means of preventing the formation of a Russo-Slavonic empire, and of opposing the system of despotism and conquest by one based upon freedom and civilization.

"Poland would, in such a federal state, occupy a most important, if not the principal portion, and form in some measure the key-stone of that political edifice. This place in the confederation is assigned to her by her geographical position, her extent of territory, her material resources, and her past history."

The count gives his idea a clearer definition in the closing chapter of his work on the "Future Prospects of the Slavonians." He says:—

"The only effective means which Europe possesses to counteract the Russo-Slavonic empire is, we think, that to which we have alluded—namely, the transformation of Austria into a Slavonic State, which would comprehend Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and all the Austrian provinces where the Slavonic element prevails."

He imagines that this might be easily accomplished by giving the fullest development to the constitution which Austria has just promulgated; and, in that case, "The Austrian empire would form a confederated State not unlike that of the United States of America, except that the executive authority would be vested, not in an elective president, but in an hereditary sovereign."

To the feasibility of this scheme there is, we think, one insurmountable obstacle, and that is, the German element that must of necessity exist in the ruling power. It is not so clear, as the count seems to think, that it may be easily set aside. Austria is essentially German in her traditions and her sympathies, and constitutes one of the primary and most important parts of the Germanic Confederation. It is very true that, though this confederation is *ostensibly* a fact, it is as yet, in *reality*, rather a theory than a fact. It is very probable, moreover, as M. Krasinski suggests, that the individual States of Germany will soon be wearied of obeying a Parliament which they know not how to recognise and cannot be compelled to respect. Still *Germanism* is the antagonistic idea to *Panslavism*, and as long as the one exists the other will be necessary in some form as a counterpoise. The Diet at Frankfort is an experiment, and may be a failure; but, if the movement which orignated it is a fact, it will soon necessitate and find some other method of expression, should that which is now adopted prove inadequate. Austria cannot Germanize her Slavonic populations, nor is she likely to become herself Slavonized; and the existence of a confederation, in which these two conflicting elements are in active and antagonistic operation, is, we think, demonstrated as an improbability by the legitimate tendency of all M. Krasinski's reasoning.

The count alludes to the fact that the Slavonian subjects of Austria have been hitherto faithful to their allegiance, notwithstanding the German element in the Austrian rule; but the whole question of his essay is raised, if we mistake not, upon two other facts—the desire of Poland for a nationality, and the manifest tendency of the Slavonians, under Austria, to secede from her dominion, in deference to the revived instinct which places them as a race in opposition to the Germans. The Slavonians have hitherto been faithful to Austria, but will they be so in future? This is the whole question. We think not. Either Panslavism, in opposition to Germanism, is *not* a *fact;* or the Slavonians, in obeying its impulse, must choose a ruler of Slavic origin and Slavic sympathies, and seek for association with a race of like affinities.

It must be remembered that the Slavonians in Hungary have met with no sympathy from the Imperial Government: their representations have been disregarded and their complaints unheeded. The Ban of Croatia himself assumes his hostile attitude towards the Hungarians in defiance of the authority of Austria, and there is little doubt, if the gallant old warrior, Radetsky (who, by the way, is upwards of eighty years

of age, and kept his saddle for seventeen hours together in the splendid victories which he has lately gained), were not otherwise engaged, he would be sent to give an account of these turbulent tribes. Another very serious circumstance for the consideration of Austria is the advent of the Servians, and other Slavonians not subject to her rule, into the conflict. These facts afford a strong confirmation of the force of the Panslavic movement; but yield little ground for the supposition of a future Slavonian subserviency to an Austrian dynasty.

Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coute. The first step in the dismemberment of an empire is the most important: upon its character depends the nature and extent of the disruption which must inevitably follow. Austria, it is said, is sure to lose her Italian provinces; and, when these are gone, the separation of the Slavonic populations from her rule will be a natural sequence. This result is to be brought about by the intervention of England and France; and, if it come to pass, will be greatly facilitated by the disgust of Austria at the intractability of her Italian subjects. We can well understand why France should interfere: she wants an outlet for the fierce energies of a warlike population: the *plausibility* of the plea which brings her into action is necessary to her vanity—the *righteousness* of it is of no consequence. But why England, with Ireland as her clog, should interfere, we cannot understand. The cases of Italy and Ireland are in many respects very similar. There are causes of grievance in both of a like character: there are some in the English government of Ireland which do not exist in the German government of Italy. They are, in the main, causes which must inevitably exist under even the mildest rule, where countries are incapable of self-government and fall, as a natural consequence, into the power of that State whose geographical position renders it necessary to secure subjects in populations, which, in the hands of another, would become enemies. England has tested the full value of the Irish grievance, and has paid a heavy price for the privilege of protection. With what righteous consistency, therefore, she can assist in compelling Austria to part with her Italian provinces we cannot conceive. If the plea be, "the peace of the world," this is much more likely to be ultimately broken by the same spirit of treachery on the part of Charles Albert, to which she is now about to pay so heavy a premium, than by the conservative disposition of Austria. If the plea be, "the enfranchisement of an oppressed people," the fact of the oppression has yet to be demonstrated to the full extent of the assertion. The government of Austria is despotic, and the arbitrary acts which are attributed to the exercise of its rule are doubtless

founded in truth; still it has a protective and paternal element in its very constitution which seems to be entirely forgotten; and the real question is, whether this rule, with its attribute of protective influence and its accident of occasional oppression, is not better for the Italians than the anarchy into which they are sure to fall if left to themselves; or the doubtful political mercies of the monarch, who has shown himself as treacherous and as boastful as he is incapable, and to whom it would seem they are now promised as subjects. It is in evidence that the Italian provinces have greatly flourished under the rule of Austria. The nobles are wealthy, the cities have enjoyed repose, the peasantry have laboured profitably in the confidence of protection: what was plainly amiss in the government has lately been reformed—what was oppressive has been amended: something, therefore, more than Austrian misrule must now be alleged as a justifying cause of interference. We are quite aware that it is beneath the dignity of any people to accept a condition of physical comfort as a sufficient compensation for national bondage. If the Lombardians could show themselves worthy of the freedom which they seek, or able to use it aright when it is attained, we should say, let it be secured for them at any cost; but whoever has carefully attended to the acts of their provisional governments in the towns, and the deeds of their soldiery in the field in the struggles that have followed their insurrection, will see that the amount of their incapacity and cowardice has been nearly proportionate to the loudness and emptiness of their boasting.

What we chiefly complain of in this Italian drama is the want of moral and righteous compensation in the expected adjustment of the catastrophe. For example, when the curtain draws up, there is a king who, in spite of his pledged promises and with no other real ground of excuse but his own ambition, suddenly attacks another monarch, in order that he may possess himself of so much as he shall be able to wrest from him: he gets deservedly beaten for his pains. Then we have an interesting act: we see a people who rise in insurrection against a foreign ruler, and we hear them cry to Europe for aid in breaking the bonds that oppress them. After this the scene changes, and in step two powerful neighbours who say it is high time that they should interfere. According to the rule made and provided in such cases, they utter magnificent speeches upon the subject of virtue in general and their own exalted integrity, and then they are to proceed to action. Thus far we have witnessed the play: we have had the speeches and are now expecting the result. Of course, they will gravely

read the beaten king a serious lecture on the treachery of his conduct: they will secure for the oppressed people the liberty which they seek. According to the programme, they are to do no such thing! They will rescue the oppressed people from their foreign ruler, it is true; but they will give them over to the treacherous king: thus paying him handsomely for his sin, and changing the form of servitude under which they suffered for one that will be every whit as bad—so that the upshot of the whole piece is, that the worst character in it fares the best. The moral must be deduced by the spectators. The curtain will then fall, and we shall be left in a condition of curious enquiry as to what amount of common sense and common honesty is necessary to constitute the legislative wisdom and political justice of two great nations.

It is a significant fact for Austria that, at the very time her Italian provinces are to be torn from her grasp, her Bohemian subjects are in a condition nearly akin to revolt. Bohemia claims a distinct Slavonic nationality for herself; and, if once the *prestige* of Austrian rule be broken through by a successful vindication of the claim, every Slavonic population, hitherto subject to the Germans, will make common cause with the champion of the race.

"Bohemia (observes M. Krasinski) is naturally the most important province of the Austrian empire, as it has been now constituted by the constitutional charter of the 25th of April, and the key-stone of its whole political edifice; because there can be no doubt that the Italian provinces are irrecoverably lost, and Hungary does not enter into the composition as one of its integral parts, but is connected with it solely by having her crown vested in one and the same individual. The restoration of the Slavonic nationality to its full rights must invariably lead to an ethnical revolution of the whole Austrian empire, the great majority of its component parts being Slavonic and not German. The superiority, or rather the dominion of the German element over the Slavonic, was hitherto maintained in Austria by the despotic power of her government. This power being now destroyed and a constitutional order which recognises every nationality established, it is in the nature of things that the minority should submit to the majority; or the heterogeneous elements of which the Austrian empire is composed must separate, which will be tantamount to the dissolution of the empire."

The latter of these two results is that which we deem to be the most probable, and the Bohemians are evidently doing what they can to hasten it. The scattering of their Diet at Prague has only postponed the catastrophe: it has not averted it altogether.

In advocating the formation of a Slavonic Confederation

under Austria, M. Krasinski has written the passages which we have already quoted. In one of these passages there is a sentence which is an index to the prevailing idea of the noble author's mind and the nature of his wish: it also explains the motive cause of his publication. It is this:—"Poland would, in such a federal state, occupy a most important if not the principal position, and form, in some measure, the key-stone of the political edifice." The demonstration of Panslavism as a fact throughout this work is, therefore, in order to the proposition that Poland must become again a nation and a kingdom. The nationality of Poland—the resumption of her place now vacant among the kingdoms of the earth! This is the day-dream and the night-prayer of the author and many of his gallant countrymen. We do not wonder at it. There is a feeling of grief in remembering the bondage of a fatherland which strikes deep into every generous heart, and a chivalry in attempting its rescue which has a charm for every noble mind. The adversities of a conquered people deaden the feelings of those who wear the chain; but they elevate the thoughts of those who, escaping the fate of their brethren, reflect upon their suffering. From the day in which the mournful Jew uttered his sorrow in that plaintive song, "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept," down to the hour when the Polish nobles buried their hopes amid the ruins of their fallen homes and sadly left the land they could not save, it has been ever the same. Exile elicits and cherishes sentiments and begets resolves which prosperity could never excite, but it often leads to the fond fancy of a prospect which can only end in disappointment. The kingdom which a patriotic aspiration creates in imagination is a far different thing from that which is realised when the opportunity is given for its formation. The world is full of political theorising—Utopian states of society and forms of government upon paper are as plentiful as blackberries, and they are conceived in all the sincerity of faith as to their practicability. But the mischief is that sometimes men will try them in action; and then, when the experiment has cost much blood in making, it turns out a failure, having been prolific in nothing but the amount of human misery. Has it ever occurred to M. Krasinski that the consummation which he so devoutly and naturally wishes for is improbable?—and this, not so much from inherent obstacles in the policy of Europe as from the impracticability and misconduct of those who attempt it. We should be sorry to offend one who writes so well and thinks so nobly; but our own conviction is that the difficulties in the way of a Polish nationality have arisen, in a

great measure, from the Poles themselves. In 1830, their attempt was so premature and so badly organised as to paralize the efforts of those who might otherwise have aided them; whilst it ensured, in the certainty of defeat, a heavier bondage for themselves. In the general sympathy for distressed nationalities, which the recent events on the continent have created, somehow or other the Poles have never been thought of without a feeling of misgiving and a fear that any attempt in their favour would be frustrated by their own rashness. We know not what just grounds, if any, there may be for this prevalent feeling; but it is certainly an unhappy circumstance that so many wild political notions and so great an amount of reckless aggression should have been found amongst the Polish refugees of the continent. The generality of persons, however unrighteously, judge of the Polish character from the specimens which are most patent to their observation: and thus the truly virtuous and patriotic are compromised and made to suffer for the acts of their more heedless countrymen. We are not ambitious of the fate of Mr. Cobden, to whom our noble author has administered a very severe and well-merited castigation for his historical ignorance and inaccuracy; and we will not, therefore, pursue this part of our subject to any length. We cannot help observing, however, that the current of historical evidence certainly runs towards the conclusion that, if the partition of Poland and the destruction of her nationality was consummated by the perfidy of Prussia and the rampant ambition of Russia, that consummation was prepared by the vicious state of Polish society and the internal dissensions of the Poles themselves. The Diet was venal—the higher classes were dissipated and prodigal to ruin—many who had influence were bought with the gold of the stranger to maintain interests fatal to the welfare of their country—the system of serfage led to abuse and oppression—the nobles were reckless in the exercise of their privileges and the peasantry were degraded by the denial of their rights. There were bright exceptions in every case: there were high-minded men in the senate—merciful and philanthropic masters amongst the nobility—but they were too few to withstand the general current of venality that had set in. When the final struggle came, the desperate valour for which the Poles were ever famous could neither redeem the errors of the past nor cope with the treachery that was at work within the camp. All that could then be done for Poland was to grace her fall with the dignity of patriotic devotion. Her nationality expired in the defeat of the noblest of her sons:—

"And freedom shrieked as Kosciusko fell!"

Since that period, it has been the lot of the Poles to be

alternately excited to hope and doomed to disappointment. Napoleon, though perhaps without intention, betrayed them. Alexander announced intentions which he never fulfilled. Nicholas, from time to time, has flattered them only to crush them more effectually. Louis Philippe, with the cruelty of a selfish policy, made them promises, as the citizen king, which, as a dynastic monarch, he found it convenient to forget. More recently, the crusade that was everywhere preached against oppressive rules filled them with expectant joy; but they have as yet found no gain for themselves in the partial results that followed. Hope from the aid of western Europe is well nigh extinct: the work before us is almost the last, and, we fear, a fruitless effort to awaken it to life.

If the nationality of Poland is ever to be an accomplished fact, it is most likely that it will owe its origin to a source from whence it would be most distasteful to the count and his brethren to receive it; and that is, the Panslavic policy of Russia, to which he alludes as the painful alternative for Polish hopes, and the dangerous antagonist of continental interests.

The oppression of the Poles has been a Russian policy as a preparative to their amalgamation with the purely Russian constitution: whilst, however, it has been most fearfully exercised, it is worthy of remark, that it has fallen more heavily upon the higher than the lower classes. The emperor pursues a system as well in Poland as in Russia, which, whilst it secures him the enmity of the nobles, renders him popular with the masses. As he diminishes the privileges of the aristocracy he extends the liberties* of the people, and draws them closer round his throne and government. It is a desperate policy which the Russian nobles closely watch, and against which it is probable they may one day revolt; but, if it succeed, it is one which will serve him materially in accomplishing his Panslavic idea. The Poles are wearied with their own sufferings and the political jiltings of which they have been the unhappy subjects: they are disposed to yield to the plans of the autocrat if they can do so without loss of honour and without fear of treachery. A little concession on his part to the legitimate demands of the one, and a sincere guarantee against the other, and they will aid him, in all his gigantic schemes, from the pure hatred which they have of Germanism. After the affair of Galicia, in 1846, when they were greatly excited against Austria for the reward which she bestowed upon the peasant murderers, and against the German press for the torrents of abuse which it poured upon the Poles, Russia might have had their faithful allegiance upon easy terms,

* This is denied by our author.

but she suffered the opportunity to pass. This opportunity has again recurred in consequence of the inveterate hostility with which the Germans are pursuing the Poles; and this time Russia will, we think, be too wise to neglect it. If she now skilfully avails herself of it, Poland may become as powerful an auxiliary as she has been a formidable obstacle. If the Poles, as M. Krasinski justly observes, having despaired of recovering a separate national existence, once cordially enter into the Russo Sclavonic system, they *will not be whistled back* by the appeals and promises of western Europe. In that case, Poland would cease to be what the policy of Europe might and ought to make her—the barrier to Russian aggression: she would, instead, stand forth the vanguard of the assault.

Our author observes that "the object for which the Poles, Bohemians, the Croats, and other Sclavonians are striving, is not so much to acquire free institutions, which they might easily obtain by becoming Germans or Magyars, but to give the fullest development to their nationalities; and, consequently, they will enter the movement, which will lead them to the attainment of the latter object, in preference to that which will only promote the interests of the former. Now Russia, by her position and Slavic sympathies, is the most fitted to take the lead in such a movement—her proper place is at its head. The very stringency of her despotic rule and policy the better fit her to assume it, because the bulk of the populations which desire a Panslavic confederacy is by no means prepared for the dogmas or licence of liberalism. The rights and privileges for which they are struggling are rather of a national than a social character. Any infusion of Parisian doctrines would be like a man's portion of wine administered to a child; it would not strengthen but madden them. Any application of republican theories to their actual condition might teach them notions of freedom; but it would be of such a sort as should break them into sections and set their hand, like the Arabs, against all around them. Such doctrines and such theories they do not need. A full development of the paternal element which ought to exist in every despotic government—a scope and a place for the exercise of national feelings and privileges—an attention to national peculiarities—these are what is required. If Russia is wise enough to adapt her policy to the exigency, the czar will find himself at the head of a confederacy so banded together as to bid defiance to the world, and so constituted as to ensure him success in accomplishing his highest dreams of eastern conquest.

We have already, in a former number, alluded to the progress which Russia is making amongst the Slavonians under Turkish

rule: it is not needful that we here recur to this most important element in the development of the Panslavic movement. Our remarks are, of necessity, very general: we fear also that they are somewhat crude: it is difficult to give to a subject so novel and so extensive a very brief and yet a comprehensive explanation. Enough however has, we think, been said to show that this question is something more than a mere "geographical question," as it was once styled by M. Guizot. Those of our readers who desire to learn more will do well to consult the work before us. It is the work of a nobleman evidently of high mind and generous sentiments: he treats vituperation where he meets with it with quiet dignity: he detects and exposes inaccuracy, as in the case of Mr. Cobden, without exulting over the offender: he has an intimate acquaintance with the political bearings of every question which he touches, and he writes well and lucidly on a subject as yet but little known in England. He is in exile, moreover, and every sentiment which he utters, if it does not always enforce conviction, therefore demands respect. We wish that we could predicate of the cause which he has at heart that which we can certainly promise to his work—success.

In rising from the contemplation of the subjects which the work before us has presented, the enquiry is suggested to the mind, "Whither do these great movements finally tend?" "What will be their result?" That such movements exist and are characteristic of the age in which we live, no one, we think, can deny; though each will endeavour to account for them according to his particular views and the forms in which he thinks. Will they, if they be successfully developed, throw us back into the condition of the middle ages? Or are they leading us to an altered condition of society, necessary in the hastened progress of God's great purposes to their final accomplishment? We do not share the faith nor the fears of many: we do not believe, with some, that the spirit of the past can be revived so as to fit it to all the wants of the present; nor can we apprehend, with others, a retrogression, wherein the experience of many centuries must go for nothing, and the enlightenment and advancement of modern times be totally forgotten. Neither the one nor the other are possible—every step in the growth of man develops some new exigency for which a new measure of wisdom and strength are necessary; and, whilst the decrepitude of age may simulate the feebleness of childhood, the unknowingness of a condition through which we have once passed, never to return to it, cannot occur to us again. No: every altered aspect in the social history of man is a step onward either to good or evil—a progression to a condition never before experienced. Our recollections and consent are with the past, but our faith

must be in the future. These great national movements are the more significant, because we have well nigh come to the pass when "*power*" amongst men is an idle word; the *bases* on which it legitimately rests men universally dispute; and there is ever manifest some antagonistic force successfully to oppose its proper exercise and nullify its virtue. We have seen dynasties falling on every hand through the abuse of its attributes and the questioning of its claims, and we have seen it assumed on popular grounds to be contested by elements still more democratic. There is true power nowhere, because the real source of power is disowned and denied on every hand. Men have worked on in their political struggles—have ruled and have resisted in presumptuous dependence upon fleshly strength alone—and God has been rejected alike by the triumphant and the fallen: the true source of power has become with them a fable, and its true possession is therefore a nonentity. It is a subtle and a deep iniquity to give to human enlightenment and civilization the attributes which belong alone to God: it is a solemn mockery, whilst we mention with philosophic reverence his name, to deprive it of all the meaning which gives to faith its life and power. Such, however, are the tendencies of the age—such are the sins of this generation with all its social machinery of iron-hearted schemes—with all its dry statistics of crime and quacking nostrums of legislative economy for its cure. God will some day snap the whole in pieces like a broken reed: when we look abroad upon the heaving masses of mankind, convulsed by some internal leaven that is shaping them into formations meet for judgment, our conviction becomes the deeper that the day is not far distant. Who may abide it?

Nor ought we to forget that in these Panslavic and Germanic movements, there is a religious element, which gives to the political elements a greater depth and intensity: for some of those races belong to the Greek, some to the Roman, and some to the Protestant communion. Krasinski, in his former work on the rise and progress of the Reformation in Poland, has only described a state of things existing, to greater or less extent, in Bohemia, Prussia, and the other States; and the attempt made to amalgamate these heterogeneous elements by the union of Sandimir was only a foreshowing of the fruitlessness of all such endeavours; and ought to have prevented that repetition of them in the case of Prussia which we have witnessed in our own day. These things tend to dignify in the eyes of men that which would otherwise be regarded as mere political agitation, and hold out to the unsuccessful patriot the glory of the martyr's crown.

ART. VII.—1. *Bibliæ Ecclesiæ Polyglotta: the Proper Lessons for Sundays; together with the whole of the Book of Psalms in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English.* Edited by FREDERIC ILIFF, D.D. Royal 4to. London: Bagster.

2. *The English Hexapla, exhibiting the Six Important Translations of the New Testament Scriptures—Wicliff, Tyndale, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Rhemish, Authorised. The Original Greek Text, after Scholz, with the Various Readings of the Textus Receptus, and the Principal Constantinopolitan and Alexandrine Manuscripts; and a Complete Collection of Scholz's Text, with Griesbach's Edition of MDCCCV.; preceded by a History of English Translations and Translators.* Royal and demy 4to. Bagster.

3. *The Hexapla Psalter: The Book of Psalms. Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English, in Six Parallel Columns.* 4to. Bagster.

4. *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort,* A.D. 1554, *about the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies of the Church.* London: Potheram.

IT matters but little to us, in this our day, who it was that originally selected the lessons which are appointed for our daily services. Whoever they were, they were probably men of high standing in the Church, and of acknowledged character within it; but, whether Archbishop Parker and Bishop Grindall were the men, as has been surmised—whether they alone or others with them—is now nothing to the purpose, since their individual responsibility is wholly lost sight of in consequence of our Church having adopted the arrangement they proposed, and made it an essential part of her own system of public worship and general instruction. Whether the selections are well or ill made is another question: whether the subjects chosen, are the best that could be chosen, may admit of, enquiry; but we can form no clear opinion—we can come to no correct conclusions on the subject, nor fairly judge of these men's labours—until we obtain a clue to the principles which guided them in their selections. No doubt they acted upon some distinct plan and with some express object in view, and sat down to their work upon system and with an intelligible principle to work upon; but they have not left upon record what did govern them in choosing such lessons as they have chosen for the daily services; and, until we can discover what their motive in chief was in the arrangement, we are not in a condition to pass any opinion upon it nor even to give full effect to their object, while we are read-

ing in public the lessons they have selected. Such as it was, however, their arrangement remains, and will long remain doubtless *the law* to the Church, which the ministers of the Church must conform to, however little they may comprehend the reasons for such an arrangement—whatever may be their individual opinion of the defectiveness of it, or of the unsuitableness of some of the chapters for public reading and general popular instruction. And there are very many, both of clergy and laity, who think that the lessons especially for Sundays might be much better appointed than they are—that the Law and the Gospel in their mutual teaching and in their direct application to Christ might be much more impressively taught on every Lord's-day than by the present arrangement: certain it is that no man who desired to convey to the minds of his own household from two hundred and eight chapters of the Bible the greatest amount of Scriptural instruction, and to show forth the perfect agreement of the Old Testament with the New—their unity of purpose in reference to the Saviour, in reference also to the general commandments of God, and to the means of salvation afforded to men—would make use of the chapters as at present appointed to be read in our churches, simply because those chapters were selected for no such teaching—other objects pressing more upon the selectors' attention, and urging them rather to the condemnation of the prevailing error of their time than to the inculcation of the truth generally. The prevailing error was the gross idolatry of the Roman Church—its image worship, its numerous wooden idols, which crowned every roodloft and occupied every niche—which presided over every altar and claimed and received the homage from the knee, and the prayer from the lips, of all who approached them. This was the crying grievance of the age—the great abomination of the day; and it was mainly to rid the land of the evil of idolatry—to teach the people the heinousness of this sin—to prove to them how hateful it was to God—how sternly denounced by his prophets—how ruinous it was to the nations who practised it—that those portions of Scripture were selected for the first lessons, of the Lord's-day especially, which the more immediately referred to the foul and God-dishonouring sin of idolatry; while those chapters that alluded to the images that existed in the temple, and to the representations of the living creatures that were seen in visions, are most carefully excluded. Thus, it would seem to be, that the unity of God and the utter inadmissibility of any object of worship but him alone in this creation, were the great points which the selectors of the lessons were above all things the most anxious to establish, and to bring the more frequently

under the notice of our congregations. The prevailing evil of their day was idol worship, and they, therefore, chose such chapters for the lessons as would best, in their judgment, convince the people of the folly and the guilt of bowing down to images of wood and stone. Not that they, nor any of the originators nor arrangers of our liturgy, laid claim to infallibility in such matters—none but fools or knaves ever did: they were too learned and pious, too reasonable and humble, to stalk about upon stilts above the heads of other men, and to imagine themselves, in consequence, as giants in their generation: neither were they ever prating about divine inspiration, or most irreverently as some, or most blasphemously as others, using the name and boasting of the influence of the Holy Spirit as directing all their thoughts and perfecting all their labours; but they laboured in the fear of God, with the glory of God for their object, and with the hope of the blessing of God for their reward. They laboured, too, in most difficult and perplexing times, when the triumph of truth was far less considered than the triumph of party—when the approbation of a few was the utmost that could be hoped for in the hostility of the many—when sour and bitter controversialists dipped their pens in vinegar and gall and called nothing good that was not as rabid and as poisonous as themselves. Great allowances must, therefore, be made for all who had to do with the arrangement of our Church services: the Geneva and the Roman divines were alike hostile to them on all matters of doctrine or discipline, and would never allow that anything they did or could do was well done; but the men were fully equal to the emergency: strong boats are always built for stormy coasts; and they accomplished, perhaps, all that was possible in their day, and all that the peculiar errors and heresies and political circumstances of their times called for at their hands.

It does not, however, follow from this that everything they did must necessarily remain to the end of time exactly as they left it: nor did they lay claim to such super-eminent wisdom, or such prophetic foresight, as to legislate (if we may so express it) in the sixteenth century for the Church's circumstances in the twentieth: nor have we done otherwise ever since than practically to deny that we considered their decisions as final or their arrangements as complete; since we have materially altered much that they left to us, and have added four entirely new services to those they prepared for us, and are every year printing new prayers for all sorts of purposes, even to the discarding those which they provided us with for precisely similar occasions.

It is not at all impossible, therefore, that a very different arrangement may in time be made for the first and, perhaps, the second lessons in our general services. Whenever, by political or other circumstances, the State ceases to be at unity with the Church, and leaves the Church to pursue her own course without parliamentary interference, and to legislate in spiritual things as she may judge best for her own interests, the subject of the daily lessons will be early brought under the notice of her deliberative councils, and great and, probably, successful efforts will be made to wipe out the apocryphal lessons altogether. A sixth part of the year is at present occupied in reading lessons to the people that teach no truth whatever—that establish no one doctrine of the faith—that may be thought questionable in their morals, and, in some cases, present a very bad example of life, and give no good instruction as to manners. With so much that is omitted to be read of the true word of God, and with the omission of so many of the prophetic chapters which are yearly becoming of the greater interest to the Church, men will not be satisfied to have, in their stead, mere human writings read to them which have no more authority nor use than fables.

Before considering further, however, what the arrangement as regards the lessons may at some future time be, we will consider it as it now is.

Exclusive of the one hundred and fifty Psalms, there are seven hundred and seventy-nine chapters in the Old Testament: of these, one hundred and ninety are not read at all, or one-fourth nearly; and, of one hundred and seventy-two chapters in the Apocrypha, sixty-nine are omitted wholly or in part—that is, more than one-third. The New Testament contains two hundred and sixty chapters, of which fifteen are not read, or one-sixteenth. Thus, of the whole three canonical and uncanonical books, containing together one thousand two hundred and eleven chapters, two hundred and seventy-four are not read, or nearly one-fourth; while of the truly canonical books which are comprised in the Old and New Testament, and which number between them one thousand and thirty-nine chapters—even of these two hundred and five are not read, or one-fifth.

Thus, if a man was to wait on the ministrations of the Church day by day and year after year he would, notwithstanding all his diligence, be kept in total ignorance of one-fifth portion of that word which God has revealed to the world by his servants the prophets and apostles. And what is the cause that so large a portion of the Scriptures should never be heard of in our churches? "*All* Scripture is given by inspiration of God (says St. Paul), and is

profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" and there cannot be a doubt that he included the Mosaic law and the prophets in the expression of "all Scripture:" he might even mean more than this, and might design to include in the words πασα γραφη the epistles and revelations that were not then written with all those that were. But it is quite certain that the words "all Scripture" would, at the least, mean the whole of the Old Testament; and when it is thus said that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," a Church should have very strong and very sufficient reasons for keeping back any portion of the Scriptures from the people in its public ministrations and services. *A priori*, it seems difficult to imagine any possible cause, or motive, or reason, for not reading the whole of the Scriptures in the ears of the people, when all is declared to be inspired and all to be profitable, and when it is distinctly said that all is given that the man of God may be thereby made perfect and throughly furnished unto all good works—and the difficulty is increased when we find the number of the chapters so closely corresponding with the number of the days—the chapters numbering seven hundred and seventy-nine and the two lessons for each day seven hundred and thirty; and the reading together two short chapters for one lesson, and the omitting such chapters as are nothing more than a catalogue of names, and omitting such chapters also in the Chronicles as are almost word for word the same with those in Kings, would make the numbers of the two to tally together exactly: and we should, at least, have the satisfaction of laying before the unlettered portion of our congregation the whole word and counsel of God complete once during each year. But those who appointed the lessons do not appear to have considered the Church as bound to bring the whole of the Scriptures under the notice of the people: on the contrary, they studiously kept certain portions which treated on certain subjects out of public hearing altogether; and thus, in a manner, partially suppressed what they adjudged might prove a snare rather than a benefit to men's souls. In their judgment a part was better than the whole, and we now present an abstract of what they selected and what they omitted.

Genesis has fifty chapters, all of which are read save two; those two are the tenth and thirty-sixth, which treat respectively of the generations of Noah and the generations of Esau; of the others, seventeen are read twice and two thrice.

Exodus has forty chapters, of which thirteen are not read, while eleven of the remaining twenty-seven are read twice: the

thirteen omitted relate chiefly to the directions given for the building of the tabernacle, with all its altars and ornaments; the omitted chapters are from twenty-five to thirty-one, and from thirty-five to forty.

Leviticus has twenty-seven chapters, of which four only are read—viz., the eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-sixth; the omitted chapters relate mainly to the law of offerings for sin and uncleanness; but, closely interwoven as our festivals are with the Jewish, the twenty-third chapter might well have been retained and read yearly in our churches, as well as the twenty-fifth, which contains that law the non-observance of which led to the seventy years of the Babylonian captivity.

Numbers has thirty-six chapters, of which eighteen are not read: of the rest, five are read twice and one thrice: no reason can be assigned for the omission of the greater portion of these eighteen chapters, some of which are of great interest and afford much instruction.

Deuteronomy has thirty-four chapters, the whole of which are read, excepting the twenty-third, and ten are read twice and one thrice.

Joshua has twenty-four chapters, twelve of which are not read, while three of the remainder are read twice.

Judges has twenty-one chapters, which are all read, and two are read twice.

Ruth has four chapters, which are all read.

1st of Samuel has thirty-one chapters, all of which are read, and seven are read twice.

2nd of Samuel has twenty-four chapters, which equally are all read, and five of these are read twice, and one thrice.

1st of Kings has twenty-two chapters, which are all read, and six are read twice.

2d of Kings has twenty-five chapters, which are all read, and seven of these are read twice.

Of the sixty-five chapters in the two books of Chronicles not one is read. For their partial rejection several reasons might be assigned: some of the chapters are bare names of genealogies of no general interest: others are lists of families who were devoted to the service of the temple, and others detail in nearly the same words, facts that are recorded in the Books of the Kings; but the total rejection of the whole of the Chronicles is not easily to be accounted for.

Ezra has ten chapters, three of which are not read, and probably because they are little else than a long list of very hard names of but little interest to the Christian reader.

Nehemiah has thirteen chapters, four of which are not read, and those four are chiefly registers of names and genealogies.

Esther has ten chapters, of which the last is not read, probably from its brevity, as it contains but three verses.

Job has forty-two chapters, which are all read, and four are read twice.

Of the one hundred and fifty Psalms, one hundred and fifty are read eleven times in the year; one hundred and thirty-eight, twelve times; thirty-two, thirteen times; six, nineteen times; one, twenty; and four, three hundred and sixty-five times.

Proverbs has thirty-one chapters, which are all read save the thirtieth, wherein Agur confesses something more than it was considered, perhaps, advisable to read in public.

Ecclesiastes has twelve chapters, which are all read, and three are read twice.

The Song of Solomon has eight chapters, not one of which is read.

Isaiah has sixty-six chapters, which are all read; and thirty-two of these are read twice and two thrice.

Jeremiah has fifty-two chapters, which are all read; and seven are read twice.

The Lamentations have five chapters, all read.

Ezekiel has forty-eight chapters, thirty-nine of which are not read; but four of the remaining nine are read twice.

Daniel has twelve chapters, which are all read; and four are read twice.

Hosea has fourteen chapters, which are all read; and two are read twice.

Joel's three chapters are all read: the second is read thrice.

Amos has nine chapters, all read.

Obadiah, one chapter, which is read.

Jonah has four chapters, all read.

Micah has seven chapters, all read; and the sixth is read twice.

Nahum has three chapters, all read.

Habbakuk has three chapters, all read: the second of which is read twice.

Zephaniah has three chapters, which are all read.

Haggai has two chapters, both of which are read.

Zechariah has fourteen chapters, which are all read; and the ninth is read twice.

Malachi has four chapters, which are all read; while the fourth is read twice and the third thrice.

Now, it was not without a very strong reason that, while all the minor prophets are read without any exception, thirty-nine out of forty-eight chapters of such a prophet as Ezekiel are de-

nied altogether a hearing in the Church; and yet, beyond all comparison, the visions, and parables, and judgments contained in the omitted chapters, exceed by far in interest, and variety, and importance all that the minor prophets have detailed. The truth seems to be that the selectors stumbled at the visions of the cherubim: they feared to bring before the people what might be considered as a representation in some measure of the Deity; and their object being to decry idolatry, and to represent to the people the absurdity and the guilt of image worship, they appear to have thought that their object would be defeated by the occasional reading of such chapters, as so minutely described the glory of the Lord, in the likeness and the lightning-like movement, of four living creatures. But this is no reason for the omission of all those powerful and appalling prophecies and judgments upon Tyre and Egypt which remain (even to this day so literally fulfilled), and which are among the most remarkable of the predictions contained in the sacred writings; nor is it a reasonable answer to give for the omission of the last nine chapters that they are so obscure, since the same argument might be raised against all prophecy that is unfulfilled; while the frequent perusal of a prophecy is the best means to enlighten us as to the time and manner of its fulfilment; but, instead of these really edifying and inspired writings, every word of which is truth and of which the parables are among the most improving, and the prophecies among the most sublime and the most important to be found in the Scriptures, we are referred to books of no canonical authority whatever, of which the morals generally must be condemned and of which the truth of the histories they give may be more than questioned.

By far the most important of the Apocryphal books, on the supposition that they were all equally founded on truth, are the two books of Esdras; and if Esdras had those revelations made to him which he here so circumstantially details—if the angel Uriel was sent to him, as the angel Gabriel was to Daniel, to reveal to him what he here asserts he heard and saw—there never lived a greater prophet than Esdras; and no man's writings should be more honoured, as none could be more advantageously read or more profitably commented upon. The man who saw in a vision "the Son of God setting crowns on the heads of those that confessed him in the worlds," and to whom God sent his angel Uriel to say, "My son Jesus shall be revealed, and after these years shall my son Christ die"—with much more to the like purpose—is deserving of the very highest respect from Christians, and his prophecies ought

undoubtedly to be read aloud in all their churches. But so little credit was given by the selectors of our lessons, to the truth of what Esdras here says of himself, that they refused to read a single chapter from either of his two books—thus tacitly confessing that they held him and his writings in no estimation whatever.

But they took up Tobit with great zeal, and appointed all his fourteen chapters to be read, saving one. Now, their reason for rejecting that one, should have influenced them to reject the whole book. If they could not with a good conscience recommend us to teach the people that rare as the visits of the angels are, yet, when they do come down upon the earth, they lend themselves without scruple to the father of lies—and readily, and coolly, and deliberately depart from the truth, utter falsehood, and practice deceit—they ought to have known that the man who penned this utterly incredible story—this utter impossibility in an angel to do—was himself utterly unworthy of the least attention from any one who has the least regard for truth. To assert, as he has done, that an angel of God would, for any purpose whatever, utter an untruth, is so gross a departure from truth—is such an abominable falsehood in itself—that the book which contains it cannot be too strongly condemned, and cannot be too soon dismissed from our churches, where, indeed, it ought never to have been heard of.

Of the sixteen chapters of the book of Judith, all are read; and certainly the story is well told and is amusing; but even supposing it to be a true story—which is more than doubtful—its morality is bad, since it represents a very handsome woman pretending to prepare herself to minister to the worst passions of a man and then murdering him; and for this she was almost canonized. But such stories are not lessons that can be called profitable for instruction in righteousness.

Of the six chapters of Esther, none are read.

The Wisdom of Solomon has nineteen chapters, which are all read; and six of these were adjudged worthy of being read twice, and some number is omitted here even thrice.

Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, has fifty-one chapters, which are all read, save four; and seventeen are read twice. Of the four not read, one is the twenty-fifth, which is read only to the 13th verse, the remainder of the chapter being so bitter in its language about the wickedness of a woman that it was considered advisable to suppress it. The twenty-sixth chapter is altogether omitted, for reasons which will appear in the reading of it; the thirtieth chapter is read only to verse eighteen, also for sufficient reasons; and the forty-sixth chapter is read, with the exception of the last verse; and why this

verse should be omitted does not appear, since it says nothing more than what is said in 1st Samuel, xxviii.

There is much in this Wisdom of the Son of Sirach that must undoubtedly be called the wisdom of this world, and that would go far to make a very accomplished man of the world of any man who practised what it taught: its maxims are admirable as worldly maxims, but many of them are as opposite as the poles apart from Gospel simplicity and sincerity. Of the six chapters of Baruch all are read. The Song of the Three Children is not read as a lesson; but the half of it is appointed to be read in our churches every day, if we prefer it to the *Te Deum*. The chapter of Susanna and that of Bel are also read as lessons; but the prayer of Manasses is not read, nor are any of the first thirty chapters of the Books of the Maccabees. It was, therefore, evidently never the intention of the selectors of our first lessons to bring all the books of even the canonical Scripture directly under the notice of the people, since they have omitted three of the books altogether and one-fourth of the whole of the chapters of the Old Testament; and of the uncanonical books six are wholly omitted, and more than one-third of the whole of the chapters in the Apocrypha. This system of selection and rejection has been pursued, though in a much less degree, with the New Testament, which contains two hundred and sixty chapters, but of which nineteen chapters find no place whatever among the second lessons: of the two hundred and sixty, however, two hundred and thirty-eight are read thrice in the year as lessons in the daily service; twenty-nine are also read for the fourth time as lessons on holy days; eighty-five are read whole or in part as epistles; ninety-two as gospels; and three as anthems, to be sung previous to one of the collects.

No satisfactory reason has ever been assigned for the total exclusion of so large a portion of the Revelations of St. John from the services of our Church. Whether the book itself was considered as little better than apocryphal, or whether its prophecies were considered as such hidden mysteries that no profit could be expected to arise from reading them publicly in the ears of the people, or whether the same objection existed here as in the prophecies of Ezekiel to bring under public observation the vision and description of the living creatures or cherubim, must be matter of conjecture; but that our congregations in all times have lost much by the total suppression of this book, as the subject of the second lesson, there can be no question—so impressive are the warnings given to the seven Churches and so useful are those warnings in all ages to all Churches—so important are the prophecies—so well adapted to impress themselves upon the memories of men and to call into exercise their

faith and their judgment—so beautiful and sublime are the hymns of adoration this book supplies, and so encouraging and cheering are the descriptions it gives of the certain final triumph of the Church over all its enemies, and of the glory and happiness of the redeemed of Christ in heaven, that we can scarcely imagine a greater loss could accrue to the Church than the almost total rejection of this book from any place in the public service. Three of its chapters, it is true, are appointed as lessons for two holy days, and the epistles for three holy days and for Trinity Sunday are taken from it, but this is all: fifteen of its chapters remain utterly unnoticed in our churches, and may possibly remain so until the last trumpet is sounded and the last vial is poured forth, unless meanwhile our Church obtains the power to re-arrange this portion of her service and to bring more of the holy Scriptures under the direct notice of her congregations.

The present arrangement for the first lessons in our Sunday's service may possibly be, in the judgment of many, the very best that the wit of man can devise; but one consequence of it is, that it limits greatly the amount of scriptural information, which, but for it, our congregations might receive. Over and over again, year after year, they hear nothing read in the churches but precisely the same chapters; and, considering that nineteen-twentieths of our congregations are poor unlettered people, this is rather hard measure to them; since, however attentive such may be to their Sabbath duties, and however regular in their attendance upon public worship, they hear no more of the Scriptures, after fifty years attendance on morning and evening prayer, than they did in the first year: all that ever comes under their observation is the same disjointed narrative wholly unconnected with all that precedes and follows it; but, had the lessons been so arranged that the whole of the canonical books of the Old Testament should have formed the first lessons in our daily services and no selections had been made for the Sundays; with every new year a new series of chapters would be read in the ears of the people, so that in the course of a few years every chapter in the Bible would be read aloud in our churches on the Lord's-day.

The generation, however, is probably not yet born to whom could be entrusted, with either prudence or profit, the power to make any arrangement different from the present. We are too little of one mind—we hold too little to the one hope of our calling—we are too self-willed—too much influenced by party names and by personal predilections—too exclusively anxious to make our own peculiar views the rule of faith to all others, to render us of the present day useful legislators for

generations yet to come. As we find things in the Church, so must we be content to use them; and, therefore, through our day and probably long after the chapters appointed to be read in our churches will form the chapters for our first lessons; and, such being the case, our care should be to read those chapters with the most advantage to ourselves and with the greatest profit to the people; and to this end we would strongly advise, before reading these in public, to read them in private from the "Bibliæ Ecclesiæ Polyglotta:" there, in parallel columns and in a bold and beautiful type, will be found every lesson in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English—there, verse by verse and line by line, each chapter may be compared and its true meaning ascertained; and, superior to all the commentaries in the world, is such a comparison of the different translations of the Scriptures. No original thinker would adopt any other method: humanly speaking, the best linguist has most undoubtedly, in a general sense, the best understanding of the Bible, and attains to a far more clear and comprehensive view of scriptural truth than the mere reader of the opinions and commentaries of other men; and the difficulties must, indeed, be insurmountable and the subject inexplicable which he cannot explain who is able to read and to compare the Hebrew text with the Greek, the Samaritan, and the Coptic.

The younger portion of our clergy are now, almost to a man, striving for knowledge, and availing themselves of every means within their too often scanty power, to acquire sound biblical information. We are of opinion that the volume before us will greatly aid them—will be found a weekly treasure to them. It contains the Hebrew text, taken from the standard edition of Vander Hooght, amended by Allemande and Hahn. A more beautiful type we have never seen, nor one that is more agreeable to the eye to read from. The English text is from Blayney's Oxford edition of 1769, which is our standard edition; and great care has been taken with words in italics. The Greek text was taken from Bos's edition of the Vatican Septuagint, and from that of Breitinger's of the Alexandrine: the Vulgate is from the Paris edition of 1662. But, in addition to the first lessons presented in these four languages, is appended the whole of the Psalms as a Hexapla, and which forms a full third of the volume. These Psalms are presented in six parallel columns: the first contains the Hebrew text; the second our English version as it appears in our Prayer Book; the third the Latin Vulgate; the fourth Jerome's translation of the Psalms into Latin directly from the Hebrew; the fifth our English version of 1611; and the sixth the Greek text.

This portion of the volume has, however, been published separately, and we rejoice that it is so, since its value is great to all students of Scripture—and all clergymen are, of necessity, students to the very end of their days—that is, if they pass their days in fulfilling the ends of their ministry; and we consider the publishers of these most useful books to have rendered the greatest service it was in man's power to render to the Church by these and other like publications, which have reference more especially to that book which, above all, the Church most prizes, most cherishes, most desires to derive all wisdom from—the Bible. We have ourselves long profited from their labours, and largely profited from what we apprehended at times in worldly profit would be but small, or even in worldly losses considerable; but they persevered nevertheless, and the result is that there is scarcely a publication to which they affix their name that does not now meet with the most abundant encouragement and success.

Another of the publications which head this article is the "English Hexapla," which exhibits the six especially important English translations of the New Testament Scriptures—viz., those of Wicliff, Tyndal, Cranmer, Genevan, Anglo-Rhemish and Authorized: these range in six parallel columns under the Greek text, which comprises in each page just so much as there is of the English translations under it. The Greek text is after Scholz, and has this peculiarity—that it is formed almost entirely from the Constantinopolitan MSS., to which Scholz gave the most decided preference in direct opposition of opinion to Griesbach, who greatly preferred the MSS. of the Alexandrine family. But the different readings of the several schools, such as they are, are of little moment, being neither very curious nor very important—the sense of every passage in which the difference occurs being as nearly as possible the same, the variations consisting generally in the omission of a particle or the alteration of a tense. Of the text itself, it may be said that a finer specimen of Greek type was probably never seen, nor one which it is more delightful to read from or which the reader would less willingly turn from; and, altogether, the volume is "got up," as the phrase is, in the most finished manner, inviting reading and reflection.

One certain result of our examination of these various versions in the "Hexapla" will unquestionably be to convince all of the vast superiority of the Greek text still, to all and every of the English translations of it. Compared one with the other, the true sense of Scripture may in many instances be ascertained; but no one who grounds his knowledge upon these English ver-

sions alone can ever be a competent teacher of the truth, or have a clear understanding of much that the apostles speak of. We take the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews for an example. Who, from our version of it alone, would pretend to comprehend the argument of the writer, or would not rather miss altogether his real meaning? In its present state, in the authorized version, it is little else than a chapter of confusion, presenting entanglements which no ingenuity can unravel and which no commentators could explain; and this decided inferiority of all English translations should induce all, who desire to be able ministers of the New Testament, to use in private and in their own study the Greek text alone: that alone, on all critical and nice points, conveys the apostles' and the evangelists' true doctrine and meaning: they who teach should be perfectly instructed, and it is now more than ever incumbent on the ministers of our Church to draw all their supplies from the fountain-head—to learn the apostles' doctrine from the apostles' own words—leaving it to the ignorant and uncalled and so-called preachers of the Gospel to draw from very secondary sources —from versions and commentaries in the English language.

It was well done in the "Hexapla" to put the Calvinistic and the Romish translations in close juxta-position. Geneva and Rheims are here seen side by side offering their various readings and their different interpretations to the reader's attention: the Romanist certainly grievously falsifying, or most erroneously rendering, the Greek text, however closely he may have adhered to his Latin Vulgate; but the text, with the translations, is preceded by one hundred and sixty closely printed pages of an historical account of the English versions of the Scriptures, from the poem of Cædmon, in the seventh century, to King James's translation in the seventeenth.

From so wide a field of critical enquiry and scholastic research, it may well be surmised that much valuable information would be collected; and we certainly consider this historical account as one of great interest and value, as highly instructive, and most aptly placed where we find it. It gives all the information on the subject that any general reader would ever desire to know, and all that is sufficient for a very full and clear understanding of the matter. Wicliff and Tyndale have deservedly occupied a large share of the writer's attention; and he has devoted many pages to their labours, their difficulties, their persecutions, and their triumphs. If not published separately, this portion of the work undoubtedly ought to be; since the knowledge it imparts is of the highest general interest, and would be acceptable and most profitable to readers of all classes and to Chris-

tians of all denominations. As a specimen of it we subjoin the following summary of the Anglo-Saxon translations and paraphrases:—Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Esther, paraphrased by Ælfric in the latter part of the tenth century; some of the history of Kings, and, perhaps, Job, by the same; the Ten Commandments in Exodus xx., and parts of the three following chapters, by King Alfred, in the latter part of the ninth century; the Book of Psalms, two versions, in the beginning of the eighth century, by Aldhelm and Guthlac; the same book as found in manuscripts of the eleventh century; part of the Proverbs, translated probably in the close of the ninth century; the apocryphal books of Judith and the Maccabees, by Ælfric, in the latter part of the ninth century; the Gospel of John, by the venerable Bede, in the eighth century; the four Gospels, by Aldred, probably in the end of the ninth century; the Gospel of Matthew, by Farmer, probably in the tenth century; the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John, by Owen, about the same period; the four Gospels somewhat later, the published translation, and again the four Gospels, in the Anglo-Norman dialect.

Some of the above versions were underlined—Saxon being intermingled with the Latin; and the supposition is that this was done for the instruction of the priests themselves, that they might really understand what they were reading to the people. "In the possession (says the writer of the account) of a large portion of the word of God thus translated the inhabitants of this country were much better off than they were at a later period, when the Anglo-Saxon dialect was become obsolete; and it is not too much to conclude (he says) that, two centuries after the Norman conquest, there was far less knowledge of the Scriptnres in England than had been the case in Saxon days."

After the English tongue, such as it then was, had supplanted the Anglo-Saxon, the history of Scripture translations recommences just in the same way as it did before; for as Cædmon had by his "Paraphrase, or Compendium in Verse," led the way to actual translations, so at this later period all the earliest attempts, of which we know any thing to give any portion of Scripture truth in English, are found in paraphrases in verse. The first of these was executed by one Orme, or Ormin. His work is "A Paraphrase on the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles" in the style of Saxon poetry, without rhyme, exhibiting the English language in its early state. The language indicates it to belong to the twelfth century.

The next attempt at Scripture paraphrase in English is like-

wise in metre: it is contained in a very large volume in the Bodleian library: its contents are very various, although almost entirely consisting of religious poetry. Among the rest is a "Metrical Paraphrase of the Old and New Testaments." This work is supposed to have been executed before the thirteenth century; but, like the paraphrase of Orme, it is very difficult to assign a date to it.

In Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, there is a somewhat similar version of the history contained in the books of Genesis and Exodus; the date is supposed to be about the same as the above Bodleian volume: but the dialect differs, being evidently northern. In the same college there is also an English metrical version of the Psalms, supposed to belong to about the year 1300. In the Bodleian library and British Museum are other MSS. of the same version, with a more modern diction and orthography. These psalters are almost the first thing that can be called an attempt at a translation into English. They follow the Latin psalter, which was ordinarily used in the Church services, namely, the Gallican—that is, the version of the psalter corrected by Jerome in accordance with the Greek text of "Origen's Hexapla." This version was adopted in the end of the sixth century, in Gaul, and afterwards in Britain. This psalter is followed as closely by this English version as the verse will permit.

With these metrical versions of the book of Psalms ends the history of known attempts to embody the Scriptures in English prior to the fourteenth century. It will thus be seen that there was far less executed than there had been in Saxon days; so that three hundred years previously an inhabitant of England would have found much more of Scripture in his vernacular tongue than would one who lived at this time.

Prior to the fourteenth century, there is, therefore, no evidence of the existence of an English version of the Scriptures, either of the Old Testament or the New; but in the early half of the fourteenth century lived Richard Rolle, hermit of Stampole, the first of the translators of any portion of the word of God into English prose; and he appears to have translated more especially for his occupation and amusement. Although, however, he translated the book of Psalms into English prose, he made a translation in verse of the seven penitential Psalms; a paraphrase in verse of certain portions of Job; and also a profuse paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer. Other MSS. of versions in prose of parts of the New Testament are in the British Museum, and in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; but these were all, more or less, con-

nected with the Church services of that day. Thus, the earliest version of the Scriptures into English which either excited much attention, or was the instrument of any known important results, is most certainly that of John Wicliff.

The writer then proceeds with the history of Wicliff's labours, and a highly interesting history he has written on the subject—concise, and yet in every way to the purpose. But Wicliff is a name so conspicuous in the history of his country, and he is so mixed up with some of the chief characters of his day, that we need not here further allude to him than to say that all that we could now desire to know of him, of his labours and their results, we may learn in the twenty-eight pages which are here devoted to him.

In looking back to those days, which were days of such fearful trial to many, and of confiscation and imprisonment and death to not a few, we ought, at the same time, to look to our own great privileges in this our day, and to acknowledge them with grateful thanksgivings, and to rejoice in them with adoration and praise; for men's lives as well as their liberty were grievously jeopardised by their possession of a copy of the Scriptures; and such copies were then very rare and very dear commodities, costing, says Fox, five marks each—that is, 3*l.* 6s. 8d.—a sum that would purchase as much then as 120*l.* would now; but this did not deter those who were hungering and thirsting for scriptural knowledge, and who had not withal to purchase the whole book, from striving to secure a part, since for a few chapters of St. James or St. Paul a load of hay would be given or a similar equivalent in value. William Tyndale, however, by *printing* the Bible, soon altered this untoward state of things; and the details of his labours, which are given in about two dozen pages of the historical account, will be found of the highest interest; but from what toils of other men do we derive our comforts—from what troubles, and dangers, and sufferings to others, and from William Tyndale especially, have we derived the greatest of our earthly privileges, to read the word of God in a language we understand! How earnestly did this man labour—how perseveringly did he work—amidst privations, and poverty, and distress, and with the expectation of a violent death hourly present with him! Indeed, it is with no common feelings of respect and admiration that we should speak of men like Tyndale and Rogers, who laboured so hard and who perilled their lives in a cause in which so great a profit and advantage is ours: these were the truly great men of the earth—great in all that constitutes greatness—great in their talents, and resolutions, and achievements, having minds and

purposes and resolves that lift them immeasurably above all in their generation, and that will fix upon them the admiration of Christians throughout all ages !

But our limits will prevent us from pursuing this subject through any of its details; and the historical account is so concise that we could scarcely select from it without transcribing it altogether; but all the required information will be found in it upon all the versions we have here to do with. Coverdale's translation necessarily occupies many pages: he lived in stormy times, and figured prominently among the busiest actors in all the most stirring events: in his day came out Matthew's Bible, the Great Bible, and Taverner's Bible, of which very full information is here given; and so greatly were the editions of these multiplied during the short reign of Edward VI. that it is calculated there were in England at his death at least one hundred and seventeen thousand copies of the whole Bible or the New Testament in the English language. Mary's persecutions of the English Scriptures necessarily diminished the number of the copies; but, meanwhile, the exiles at Geneva published a new translation which immediately obtained great popularity, and through many years retained it.

On Elizabeth's accession, Cranmer's Bible became the authorised version; but, complaints being generally made against it, a new translation was undertaken which received the name of the "Bishops' Bible;" and, as it now seemed hopeless to the Papists to prevent the publication of the Bible in the English language, they undertook a translation from their Bible in Latin, which version is here called "Anglo-Rhemish." So things remained until the accession of James I., when it was determined again to revise the English Scriptures, great inconvenience arising from the fact that, while the Bishops' Bible was the authorised version in the churches, the Genevan Bible was so very generally to be found in houses.

James's interference in the matter was of the most essential service; and sufficient credit, we think, has hardly been given to him in these times for the useful suggestions he made and for the firmness of purpose he showed: the result was, that forty-seven persons were collected together, from whose united labours sprung our present authorised version.

"And how was this version received? (says the writer of this account, whose answer we subjoin). The Bishops' Bible had been the translation read in churches previously, and this became wholly superseded by the new version: the Geneva Bible, which was the household version, maintained its ground for some time, but gradually gave way; so that this translation soon became the only one in general use:

and if a testimony were needed to the general excellence of this version, an appeal need only be made to the fact that it has maintained its ground for two hundred and thirty years. It has been as highly esteemed by the learned as by the unlearned; and, although many minor particulars might be corrected to advantage, yet the version taken as a whole is admirable. It is impossible to form any estimate of the blessings in result which have flowed from this version: the translators acted in their labour as became the servants of Christ: they knew that it was vain to trust in themselves; and thus, like Tyndale and Coverdale before them, they laid their work before the Lord in prayer and found in so doing that he to whom they trusted was, indeed, faithful."

To all who desire to attain to an exact meaning of any text, these various versions will be found most valuable helps, and more especially when reference is made to the Greek text above. An instance or two will explain this. In John x. 16, occur the words *αὐλῆ* and *ποίμνη*, which Tyndale translates by "fold" and "flock;" while in the five other versions both are incorrectly rendered by "fold" alone. Again: in Hebrews x. 23, we find *κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, which, in five of the versions, is rightly rendered "our hope," but which our authorised version has translated "our faith. Many similar variations will be detected by a comparison of one version with the other, all of which conduce to one end to make the true reading known; and in this consists the great merit of the work and its especial usefulness. We hold it in consequence in the highest estimation: we believe it to be of the most essential service to many for discovering the true sense of Scripture: we think it eminently useful—very efficient for both consolation and instruction—and the most valuable work of its kind that ever came under our observation; and, if ever our authorised translation should again be brought under review, a careful comparison of all the standard versions of Scripture in the principal languages of Christendom would become necessary; and, consequently, such works as those before us prepare men for such a task. And the variations which we discover between version and version serve to show the difficulty of a perfect rendering of the original, even when all the most learned men of the age unite their endeavours. Much more questionable would be the success of any single individual however learned he might be; and we should extremely deprecate any private tampering with the text. If our authorised version is to be improved, it must be undertaken by a body of men not less numerous, nor less learned and orthodox, than those to whom the last revision was committed by King James.

ART. VIII.—1. *Mithridates Minor; or an Essay on Language.* By H. WELSFORD, Esq. Longmans. 1848.
2. *On the Origin and Ramifications of the English Language.* By H. WELSFORD, Esq. Longmans. 1845.
3. *The Origin of the English, Germanic, and Scandinavian Languages and Nations.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A. Longmans. 1848.
4. *A Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A. London: Smith. 1848.

IT is a remark of Halbertsma, as quoted by Dr. Bosworth, p. 35, that, "in comparing kindred languages with each other, the scholar will generally start from the point where he was born." But, taking our stand as Englishmen on our own language, the Anglo-Saxon will claim our first attention as the basis of English; and "Anglo-Saxon being one of those languages called 'dead,' a knowledge of its pronunciation cannot be obtained from the people themselves. Of course, therefore, all information in these matters depends upon the written letters, and upon determining the sound of those letters. This, however, is a very difficult task. *There is no connexion at all between visible marks and audible sounds:* the letters serve more to indicate the genus than the species of the sounds, and use alone can teach us the shades *(nuances)* of pronunciation." In the Anglo-Saxon there exists also another cause of ambiguity as to the sound of words, arising from the various ways in which the same word is found to have been written; and that not only by different individuals living at distant ages, but even by the same writer, in the same composition, varieties in the orthography are to be found. "This diversity in the spelling of a word is of the greatest importance to one who would ascertain the true pronunciation of the Anglo-Saxon. While the writer is groping about him for proper letters, we guess the sound he wished to express by assuming some middle sound between the letters he employs" (38). To feel the importance of this we need only to recollect a few of the words in the English which have undergone changes either in sound or in the mode of spelling during our own time, and the many words which are spelt alike but sounded differently, or which are sounded alike but spelt with different letters; and we know, as historical facts, that it was the same in Latin and Greek, and in every other language (*save* ONE) of which we have sufficient remains to institute the comparison; and it is evident that it

must have been so in all these cases, and the more so in proportion as the more ancient languages are examined, and are looked at while in a state of progress from a ruder to a more polished form, or as they belong to a more or less civilized people.

Yet these changes which take place, whether in the spelling or in the sound of words, are not be to regarded as merely arbitrary and without any principle; but they result in general from the reciprocal action of two principles, one of which governs the pronunciation; while the other governs the orthography of languages. The speech of the different families of mankind is *their own*—they have not borrowed *their mother tongue* from other nations—this principle governs the pronunciation: the writing of the different families of mankind is *not their own*, but has been always borrowed: all letters may be traced to some alphabet, and the original *alpha-bet* is the *aleph-beth* of the Hebrew language. On this head we must refer again to Halbertsma:—

"I fear (says he) that those who credit what I have stated, about the diversity of dialects, will consider these infinite variations as the curse of Babel. They will, however, permit me to say that human speech, in general, has its mechanical rules fixed by *the frame of the organs of speech* to which all tongues submit. This frame admits modifications to which every nation yields. These modifications admit of farther modifications, to which not only districts but even villages are liable: therefore, every language is, of necessity, what it is, and it is not in the power of fancy or choice to obey or disobey these laws."

It hence follows that it is not correct to say that one language is derived from another, because it only means that two languages are of the same stock—that is, the nation has migrated or has colonized, and its people have carried their own language with them. It does not mean that any people was without a language, and was indebted to another people for teaching them how to speak; but a people which, from simplicity of manners and paucity of ideas, have had a meagre language, may borrow from a more advanced people new words to express new ideas; and then, in borrowing these words, they would conform them to the idiom of their own tongue which would be only enriching a barren language not adopting a new one. Thus, the English, imported with the Anglo-Saxons from Germany, has borrowed from the Roman, and Greek, and Norman languages; yet has retained its own peculiar character by incorporating and reducing to the same idiom the heterogeneous words which it has borrowed.

Of our writing, on the contrary, it is equally certain that nothing is our own, but that all has been borrowed. If Cæsar is to be trusted, the Britons used Greek characters in his day. The Romans, in their long occupation of Britain, naturalized their own form of letters amongst us. Some few Runes came in from the north, not generally, not always independently, but in conjunction with the Anglo-Saxon characters; and these last were in substance Mæso-Gothic, and, therefore, scarcely differed from the written Greek and Roman letters of the same age. The cursive forms which letters afterwards assume is another question, and depends upon the materials which are employed for the purpose; for, as in sculptures on stone, square forms would be preferred as more easily executed on such a substance, so, for writing on paper with pen and ink, the letters would become rounder and flow into each other; but, in one respect, the written characters, in being borrowed, confirm the position laid down of the unalterable distinctions which subsist between one spoken language and another; for the letters are borrowed with the conventional sounds attached to them, and applied to those sounds which most nearly resemble the same in the language which borrows them. But it almost invariably happens that the language and the borrowed alphabet cannot be made to agree; for the alphabet is found to have more sounds of one kind and fewer sounds of another kind than those who borrow it require for their own language: as, for instance, the four last letters of the Greek alphabet have been rejected as useless by all the western nations of Europe; and all of them have added to their alphabets some letters unknown in Greece, as C, J, Q, Y, V, W, Z, and F; and some of these letters are either ambiguous or unnecessary in languages which have yet conventionally adopted them.

The Anglo-Saxon, for its dh and th, was led to invent two letters which are peculiarly its own: and the English in using the same letters for such different sounds as *that* and *thing*, or *Church* and *Christian*, has caused ambiguity, which would have been better avoided by adding other letters to the Roman alphabet to represent these sounds. But, above all our native examples of the inconvenience of restriction to the mere number of letters found in the borrowed alphabet is the Welsh language, which, having great affinity with the Celtic and Asiatic languages, and yet using only Roman letters, is obliged to combine consonants and double them in a strange way, and to press *w* and *y* into their service as *vowels*, in order to express a greater variety of sounds than the simple Roman alphabet is capable of expressing; and they have thus given to the written

language of Wales a very uncouth and barbarous appearance: even the English would have done better if they had enlarged their alphabet, as they would thereby have retained many Anglo-Saxon sounds which have disappeared from our written language, having been softened so as to be scarcely perceived in polite conversation; these are now only to be found distinctly retained in the various provincial dialects; for, as Dr. Bosworth asks—

"Is not the English tongue, as to its descent and substance, still a genuine daughter of the Anglo-Saxon? Does she not bear to this very day some feature of her fair mother, notwithstanding her foreign ornaments? Do not many Anglo-Saxon vowels still exist in Yorkshire, in Scotland, and in other provincial dialects of England? May not the English alone boast of having preserved the true sound of the old etch (th), which has disappeared from the whole continent of Europe, so as not even to leave the means of forming a faint idea of the sound of this consonant without the aid of the English? Why should we consult only the Gothic or the Icelandic, which is still more remote from the Anglo-Saxon? Why should that which is *unknown* be sought amongst the *unknown*, rather than in that which is *known* in the remains of the old sounds of the language? With a competent knowledge of the subject, and fair induction, no source can afford so much light in the pronunciation and other peculiarities of the Anglo-Saxon as the English" (78).

Shakespeare, among English authors, is the one from whose writings the largest portion of information is now to be extracted on these points, for his language is at once rich and idiomatic: it is rich in the abundance of words, and every variety of expression which the language admits of; and yet never is there any departure from the true idiom of the language—it is correct English both in the words and in the construction throughout; yet, Shakespeare was not learned, in the vulgar sense of the word; but, as Dryden observes in his preface, he was truly learned, for he possessed that knowledge which learning is expected to confer and for which alone it is worth the trouble of pursuit. He studied not mankind or their language "through the spectacles of books:" he consulted his own bosom for human nature, and he looked to living men to learn the language of mankind: and common sense teaches us to do the same in our philological enquiries: we, from *living* languages which are *known*, may draw analogies for our guidance in examining the analogies which subsist between the *dead* languages which are *unknown*.

And the English language has the peculiarity of having been able to enrich itself by the *incorporation* of new words, when

they became requisite, to express the newly-acquired ideas of modern art or science, and has done so without impairing its force or destroying the native idiom. And although the introduction of foreign words, and the moulding of them to an English form, have led to other fundamental laws in the English language, yet every one will allow the great advantages which have resulted from such a change. "While all the stores of the numberless tongues on the globe became perfectly English, when introduced into English, the Dutch, on the contrary, which may boast of exquisite purity, cannot adopt a single word without its bearing the mark of its foreign origin." Camden, somewhat vain gloriously, observes:—

"Whereas, our tongue is mixed, it is no disgrace. The Italian is pleasant, but without sinewes, as a still fleeting water: the French delicate, but even nice as a woman, scarce daring to open her lippes for fear of marring her countenance: the Spanish majesticall, but fulsome, running too much on the *o*, and terrible like the divell in a play: the Dutch manlike, but withall very harsh, as one ready at every word to pick a quarrell. Now we, in borrowing from them, give the strength of consonants to the Italian, the full sound of words to the French, the variety of terminations to the Spanish, and the mollifying of more vowels to the Dutch; and so, like bees, we gather the honey of their good properties and leave the dregs to themselves: and thus, when substantialnesse combineth with delightfulnesse, fullnesse with finenesse, seemlinesse with portlinesse, and currentnesse with staiednesse, how can the language, which consisteth of all these, sound other than full of all sweetnesse?" (*Camden's Remains*).

"If we have lost in simplicity, we have gained in copiousness and euphony: and the English have now a language which, for copiousness, power, and extensive use, can scarcely be surpassed. It is not only used in England, Scotland, and Ireland, but in the whole of North America and Australia: it prevails in the West Indies, and is more or less spoken in our vast possessions in the East. Indeed, wherever civilisation, science, and literature, prevail, there the English language is understood and spoken" (*Bosworth*, 34).

The *strength of character*, which has given to the English the command of such extensive possessions, is not less observable than the *language;* and we ascribe both peculiarities in the main to that remarkable feature in the history of England—the influx of several distinct tribes from different parts of the continent, who, obtaining permanent settlements in the country, became amalgamated into one nation, the Saxons being the most numerous, imparting thereby that strength and character, which pre-eminently belonged to them, to all the rest: and we attribute nothing, in these respects, to the soil, or climate, or local circumstances of England: everything has resulted

from the *original character* of the dominant tribe—the Anglo-Saxon character—which, though softened and polished by civilisation, has proved itself to be, in all its main features, indestructible.

And from this we would draw two general inferences—first, that there is in every one of the various tribes of mankind a character of its own, manifested especially in its language, which is averse to amalgamation with other tribes and resists it to the utmost; secondly, that where two languages present striking affinities the more cultivated and more advanced of the two is the language which is derived from the other, and not the simple from the copious language. And we further hold that a total change in the language spoken by any people would be a physical impossibility and contrary to all experience; and that wherever any considerable change has been wrought it was brought about by a large influx of other tribes of men—just as the Moors left many traces of their language and customs in Spain, or the Mongolians in Hindostan.

The truth is, that each language has its own distinct character, which none but those who have spoken it from their infancy can fully understand, and none but they possess organs of articulation suitable to express. We can perceive the distinction in extreme cases, as between the Chinese, whose language is monosyllabic, and the North Americans, with their interminable words of twelve or fourteen syllables: but the distinction would be found between any two of the primary languages if we had always tact enough to discover it. No Frenchman can properly articulate our *th* or *ch*; and when the Hebrew grammarians wish to convey some idea of the true sound of the letter *ain*, they have no means of doing so by any letter in the western alphabets or any sound in European languages; and the moan of the calf, not the speech of a man, is the nearest approximation of sound with which they can compare it.

But then, on the other hand, looking at the alphabets in use among mankind, these are not diverse; for these we can as surely deduce from one source, and trace for their origin to one language, as we can separate the many languages of mankind from one another, and assign each dialect to its distinct tribe or family: and it necessitates the division of any enquiry into the origin of language into two distinct branches, spoken languages forming one branch, written languages forming the other; but we are stopped at the very threshold in our first branch of enquiry by the fact that all the first spoken languages are extinct —they are now dead languages; and, of our own speech, we are only able to trace its backward course to the Anglo-Saxon,

and to a time further removed from the founders of that race of mankind than we are from the Anglo-Saxons.

And thus, trusting to historical and internal evidences alone, we are shut up to the conclusion that there are many distinct sources or fountain-heads of the different languages of mankind, which negatives the idea of reducing the existing forms of speech to any one system, and constrains us to a conclusion substantially the same with that which Scripture informs us was actually the case—that the speech of mankind was confounded in order to compel each tribe to take up the quarters which God assigned to it and thus to colonise the earth: and this carries with it the consequence that all the individuals in each tribe spake in one dialect that was peculiar to the tribe, which dialect was not understood by any of the other tribes, who all spake each in its own peculiar dialect. And nearer than this to the truth, concerning the diversity of languages, we have no means of arriving, though we may reasonably infer from Scripture and from observation that the original dialects were not more than seventy.

We have every reason, however, to conclude that this diversity of dialect was originally only a difference in the pronunciation of the same words, and that it is time alone, operating upon this different mode of articulation, that has effected the changes in grammatical construction, composition, and inflection which we subsequently observe and ourselves experience; therefore, as all are agreed that the primitive language was one, a similarity of sound between the primitive words in certain dialects does not necessarily prove that those dialects have borrowed *from each other:* it only proves that *both* have been derived from *one source*—the primitive language—the common source of all the dialects of mankind. But we are obviously not in possession of the means to determine whether these sounds originally were similar or dissimilar with any certainty; for we know the words only *in writing*—only as *relics of a dead language;* and, as we have already said, we necessarily attach to these letters the sounds with which we are familiar; but whether these are the true and the original sounds of those words as spoken at the beginning we know not.

Our investigations, therefore, concerning the one primitive speech of mankind, and into the seventy dialects produced by the confusion of Babel, or the many subdivisions of these which the lapse of ages has produced, can have no satisfactory results; but must be regarded as nothing better than speculation. It is not so, however, with the alphabets which have been used among the civilized nations of the earth to perpetuate their spoken

language; for here we have something fixed and tangible before us, and a living record, so to speak, of the dead languages and extinct generations of mankind; but it must be taken up by itself, and must not be mixed up with the first branch of enquiry, which relates to language as consisting of *audible sounds*? for it relates to another branch of enquiry relating to *visible signs*, and the confounding of these two perfectly distinct enquiries has occasioned endless perplexity and error; but they are as distinct from each other as the sense of hearing is distinct from that of sight.

If we were not so familiar with the use of letters, it would astonish us as a superhuman discovery; and it is certain that, in the old world, all the nations who did write ascribed the invention of letters to some god. Yet we know that the alphabet, in passing from nation to nation, and in descending from the earliest to modern times, has undergone certain changes both in form and application, which changes are so many indications of an altered condition of the things to which it was applied, and this in an order of sequence by which we may approximately estimate the time: just as we know that the retention of the *digamma* marks a very early period in the literature of Greece.

The first invention of letters is involved in impenetrable obscurity. We regard the various assertions which have been made, whether by the ancients or the moderns, as entitled to no respect, since they are not supported by evidence. But passing by the invention, and taking letters as we find them, the earliest of which we know anything with historical certainty are the Hebrew, which are twenty-two and are arranged in alphabetical order, and which, in being used, were written from the right hand side of the page towards the left, contrary to our own practice. We are not aware of any reason why letters should be arranged in one order rather than in another; yet it is certain that the Greek and all our western alphabets originally followed the order of the Hebrew alphabet, and also for some time wrote in the same direction—namely, from right to left, as many inscriptions and various Grecian and Etruscan coins prove beyond question.

But that the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Hebrew is most clearly evident from the changes or accommodations which became necessary in adapting a borrowed alphabet to a language of a different character: for the Hebrew language, having some sounds which the Greek language had not, some of the Hebrew letters had to be rejected as useless; and the Greek language having some sounds which the Hebrew had not, new letters had to be invented for these sounds. The Hebrew

letters rejected were three, vau, tsaddi, and koph; the new letters invented were five, upsilon, phi, chi, psi, and omega. That the three dropped letters were at first for a time used by the Greeks there can be no doubt: for the vau was their *digamma*, and has passed into our alphabets as the letter F: the tsaddi is found on coins of Xanthus, and has become our Z; and the koph is found on coins of Crotona, and is become our Q. These letters having remained long enough in the Greek alphabet to have passed on to its early derivatives, although for writing Greek itself they were dropped nearly at the time when the Greeks ceased to write from right to left, and after a short interval, of the alternate or boustrephodon order, wrote uniformly, as at present, from the left hand towards the right. The father of Grecian history, Herodotus, who wrote about the middle of the fifth century before the birth of Christ, asserts his belief that letters were introduced from Phœnicia, by Cadmus, "which, it appears to me (saith he), were not in Greece before." This is the earliest historical testimony that we possess; and it is of no importance whether Cadmus was a real personage, or only a name derived from "kadem," which in Hebrew signifies the "east;" or whether Phœnicia Proper, or only the eastern continent, was meant. It can be proved that about eight hundred years before Christ the Greeks wrote only in the oriental manner—that is, from right to left—and that the letters were, both as to form and as to the alphabetic order of arrangement, as nearly as might be, the same as the Hebrew.

To complete the proof of the Hebrew derivation of the Greek alphabet, we must notice another feature which they have in common, before passing on to the changes which the Greek alphabet itself has undergone. That feature is the use of the letters of the alphabet for numeration, before the time when figures were introduced by the Arabs or the Roman numerals were known. The Greeks as well as the Hebrews used the letters of the alphabet, which were in the Hebrew twenty-two in number; but five of these letters—viz., caph, mem, nun, pe, and tsaddi—had two forms, being written differently at *the end* of a word from the form they have when standing at the beginning or in the middle of a word; and as twenty-seven letters are needed to form a complete system of numeration from one to a thousand, these five final letters were used for the numbers 500, 600, 700, 800, and 900, when the usual forms of the alphabet were exhausted; but the Greek alphabet has no letters o double form, like the Hebrew finals; yet it has five addition a letters following tau—viz, upsilon, phi, chi, psi, and omega and thus capable of taking the very same places as num

which the Hebrew finals occupy, provided the preceding letters of the Greek alphabet were twenty-two. We have already intimated that the Greek letters were at first twenty-two, and that the forms of the *digamma*, the sanpi, and the koppa, are preserved on many coins and monuments. And these three letters were still retained as *numerals* after they ceased to be used as *letters*, and were called *episema* marks, to distinguish them from letters, which were called *stoicheia:* nay, more, the first of them, which was called *digamma* when used as a letter, was called *episemon bau* when used as a numeral, proving that it had been the Hebrew vau, as the sanpi and koppa are manifestly tsaddi and koph. And one alteration has been made, by removing the sanpi out of its first place, which only adds greater strength to the argument: for this being the last of the Hebrew letters which had a *double* form, stood last in the Hebrew system of numeration in its *second* form, and the Greek sanpi does not now stand where the *first* form of tsaddi stood, but in the place of its *second* form; evincing still more clearly, by this apparent deviation, that it was the Hebrew example they were following, and showing, moreover, how Z has come to occupy the last place in our own alphabets.

Nor should we omit to remark, by the way, that iod and iota stand for the number ten, and that this letter is represented by a single stroke in almost all alphabets. The chief exceptions are found in the Samaritan and Phœnician alphabets, which form this letter like a trident, or some still more irregular and complex figure. This consideration, which applies in some degree to every one of the letters in the Phœnician and Samaritan alphabets, is abundantly sufficient to convince us that those alphabets are not to be regarded as fountain-heads, but as derivatives. The simple is never derived from the complex, but the complex from the simple.

The letters which thus came from the East into Greece indicated, by their very forms, the quarter from whence they came: for all those which have a frontage like B and E, were originally written fronting to the left thus, ⊐, ∃—that is, both in the direction in which the lines ran, and towards the west, regarding it as the left in looking at the map of the world. They proceeded westward with very little change as far as civilization had then extended, which was little beyond Sicily, and the southern and western parts of Italy. The Umbrian, Oscan, and Etruscan coins are very numerous, and indicate considerable advances in civilization; and some of the coins of Sicily, of Caulonia, and of Metapontum, exceed, as works of art, the contemporary coins of Greece. But during the times to which we refer, and reach-

ing down to the seventh century before the Christian era, the letters are all turned and read towards the left hand, and are manifestly borrowed from the Greek; for they bear the Greek form of the digamma and the koppa, and not the Hebrew form of vau and koph. But about six hundred years before Christ, or only a short time earlier, there was a change made, both in Greece and Italy, in the direction which writing took, and in the *frontage* of the letters: for the letters themselves were turned round, and men began to write from the left hand towards the right, according to the method at present in use among ourselves; and it is somewhat remarkable, as a coincidence, that at this time letters, which had first come to Europe from the East, were finding a way back towards other eastern quarters of the world through Egypt: for it may be proved that Egypt got the Coptic alphabet from Greece about this time from the form and order of the Coptic letters, by a process of reasoning very similar to that by which we arrive at the conclusion that the Greeks had derived theirs from the Hebrew: the form, the partial dropping of some, and the addition of other letters, lead to the same inferences.

But we must pass by Egypt for the present, and must stretch away far to the east, that we may have a little space remaining to explain in some degree, though we cannot on this occasion fully develop, the opinions which we have formed concerning Sanscrit—that marvellous and mysterious phenomenon among the languages of mankind. For we are not only at issue with Sir W. Jones, and the past generation of oriental scholars, on the comparative antiquity of the Sanscrit language; but are probably differing from a great majority of those now engaged in similar pursuits, and who, from superior talent and from exclusive devotion to the subject, are more competent to form correct opinions than we are. But, with all deference to others, we would say that we are not without hopes of making good our point. Vans Kennedy was our class-fellow; and, as there was then a generous emulation between us in competition for classical honours, so we may, without arrogance, say that we have endeavoured to build upon the foundations which were thus laid in youth with no less diligence than that which was manifested by him in prosecuting his studies in the course of oriental literature.

We think that Sir W. Jones, and all those who endeavour to trace the connection between dead and living languages by similarity of sound, have been following a phantom as vain as the boy who would strive to catch the rainbow. The sounds of dead languages are gone—irrecoverably gone; and, although we

may have the letters in which the languages were written, this helps us not at all, for we know not the precise sound of any one of those letters. And this truth has infinitely greater force when the dead language is Asiatic, and when an European is endeavouring to establish the connection through similarity of sound; for Sir W. Jones himself has over and over again told us that he found it impossible to represent correctly the Asiatic sounds by means of the Roman alphabet. And, if the dull ear of an European was yet sensitive enough to perceive thus much, how much more difficult would it be for such an one to apprehend, so as to convey distinctly to others, the analogies or differences between those oriental languages which are all now extinct or dead? We mean to pursue the safer and, as we think, the only satisfactory course, by dismissing sounds altogether, and by dealing with Sanscrit merely as a written character, and tracing its resemblance to, or difference from, the other written characters of mankind.

The first thing that strikes us in the Sanscrit is the order in which it is written, it being the European, or that which begins from the left hand and is written towards the right. This is contrary to the order observed in Hebrew, Arabic, Persian, and all other oriental languages of early date; and was not adopted, even in Greece and Italy, till about seven hundred years before the Christian era. The next peculiarity consists in the very great number and the systematic classification of the Sanscrit letters: they are thirty-five in number, and they are not ranged alphabetically, but are classed in groups, as palatal, dental, lingual, or labial, according to the organs of utterance. Now, we unhesitatingly pronounce both these characteristics of Sanscrit to be indications of a comparatively later origin: they belong to the language of a people among whom letters have been for a long time cultivated, partaking the nature of speculative and philosophical refinement rather than of practical utility. The Hebrew letters were only twenty-two, and remained in alphabetic order during the longest period of time of which we have any authentic records; and of the alphabets existing in the west we can trace the pedigree to this one source, and shew how and when the several additional letters have been introduced to swell the original number. If there be so great an affinity between Greek and Sancrit as Vans Kennedy and others have supposed, and if Greece in its language derived so much from the Sanscrit as they have also supposed, how came it to pass, we ask, that Greece omitted to borrow the Sanscrit letters also? How came she to take up with so opposite a system as the Hebrew alphabet—how the Sanscrit came to

be written from left to right—how the letters became so numerous—how they came to be arranged in philosophical and not in alphabetic order? These are questions which we cannot at all answer on the supposition of the Sanscrit being a primitive and independent system: but if it be allowed to rank as a derivative, and we set about finding its place with the Arabic, and Coptic, and Ethiopic, as derived from the Hebrew, in a way which though indirect is intelligible, we think that we can account for it.

Concerning the sources and probable age of the refined Sanscrit character a new light has arisen in our own day, and in two different quarters, both of which coincide in one point of time not very remote, and lead to the conclusion that the antiquity of that character which we call "Sanscrit" has been much over-rated—we allude to the decyphering of ancient inscriptions on the rocks near Madras, and on coins found in Upper India and Bactria, both of which characters are very similar and seem to furnish the elements out of which the Devanagari or present beautiful system used for writing the Sanscrit was composed. Those inscriptions on the rocks were regarded as the oldest alphabetic characters of India, and as preserving the form in which Sanscrit had been written at the earliest of its epochs. They are much ruder in form and consist of fewer lines than the present letters of India, and they more nearly resemble the rock inscriptions of Hadramaut and Southern Arabia which have been decyphered by Mr. Forster.

These inscriptions remained unexplained until Mr. J. Prinsep took them in hand: and when, by his sagacity, a value was assigned to the letters and they were forced to disclose their contents, great was the surprise of all men to find that the names of the Egyptian Ptolemy and of the Syrian Antiochus were inscribed on these rocks of Madras. Not less surprising and still more complete, as being a chronological series commencing from the same time, is the evidence furnished by the Græco-Bactrian and Indian coins, of which a large collection exists in the Museum at the India-house, obtained by the enlightened officers in the service of the Company. When a few only of these coins had been examined it was evident that the legends, in many cases, consisted of such characters as those which were inscribed on the rocks at Madras: but a careful classification of the whole series has shown that these were coins of Hindu sovereigns and the latest in point of time, and that the names of their predecessors are to be traced on the other coins, becoming more and more Grecian in style, one of the earliest being a coin of Theodotus, who revolted from

Antiochus Theos about two hundred and fifty-five years before the Christian era. "The recovered monetary series belongs to the last five conturies of hieroglyphic literature, and has unfolded to us a line of princes reigning over the conterminous provinces of Persia and India, during the whole period of the Parthian monarchy, while Egypt was swayed by the Macedonians and Romans in succession. Its bilingual inscriptions have likewise unfolded a chain of literary data of no small importance towards resolving the problem of the Sassanian literature, and explaining the origin of the writing and inscriptions of that line, with the epoch of which, in the third century of our era, they connect themselves" *(Pro. of Num. Soc. Lond.)* "It will, in fact, be found that our coin alphabet is connected with the Semitic system to the west of Bactrian India by the omission of vowels, the form of the characters (among which those of the *Beth* of Abagasus, the *Tsaddi* of the Titles, the *Daleth* and *Resh* of most of the coins, and the *Samech* of all, are at least indisputable), and the order of writing them; with the Sanscrit, to the east and south, by the language which they envelope, as well as by an analogous series of letters affected by the vowels; with the Amharic by the vowel points and extra alphabetic characters; and with the ancient Egyptian by the number of characters, the homophones, and syllabic letters; so as to connect these several systems" *(Dr. Lee's Address to the Num. Soc.* 1839).

Those who wish for a detailed description of these coins will find it given by Professor Wilson in the seventh number of the *Numismatic Journal.* Our object is only to use them for establishing the connection between Sanscrit and the other better known alphabets, both of the Semitic and Japetian families—with the Hebrew and Arabic on the one hand, and with the Amharic and the Greek on the other. The coin alphabet, as Dr. Lee remarks, is a genuine offspring of the Hebrew, indicating its parentage by the form of its letters and by being written from right to left. Yet it is used to write an Indian language, and is in this respect, as well as in its vowel letters, analogous to the Sanscrit: while it and the Sanscrit have both that method of combining vowels and consonants so as to form of both one letter or character, in which no other alphabet than the Amharic resembles them, save, in a partial manner, the Runic.

We believe that the antiquity of the Sanscrit alphabet ought not to be placed so high as the age of Alexander the Great; and we think that it is derived from the Hebrew, through the media of Arabic and Amharic characters, although these alphabets at present differ from each other so widely in respect

to forms. But, in order to be understood, we must advert to a class of alphabets which agree with each other in principle, and even in the name, power, and order of several of the letters, and yet differ from each other in many or all of the forms. We have instances of this in Europe, such as the Runic of which the history has not been handed down to us, and the Slavonic and Illyrian alphabets, which are of such recent origin that we know every step of their history, the former having been invented by Cyril, A. D. 863; the latter by Jerome, A. D. 1222, or even later. Cyril was also called Constantine, and is commended for this very thing by John VIII. in one of his pontifical letters. And it was through the success of his missionary labours, in conjunction with his brother Methodius, and in order to translate the Gospels into the language of those among whom they laboured in Bulgaria and Moravia, who up to that time were wholly unacquainted with letters, that Cyril invented the Slavonic alphabet. Dobrowsky speaks of it as follows in his Slavonic grammar:—

"Soni linguæ Slavicæ omnes et singuli neque Latinis, neque Græcis characteribus exprimi possunt. Hinc ingeniosa inventione opus fuit ad constituendum alphabetum omnibus numeris absolutum. Auctor illius Constantinus Philosophus, alias Cyrillus dictus, Methodii Pannoniæ et Moraviæ Archiepiscopi frater; Slavis primum Bulgariæ, deinde Moraviæ daturus Evangelium aliosque libros liturgicos, hoc consilio usus est, ut Græcos characteres fundamenti loco substerneret, sonorum a Græcis alienorum signa ex aliarum nationum, Armenorum videlicet et Coptorum, alphabetis mutuaretur, reliquisque adaptaret, ac missis nominibus literarum Græcis seu Phoeniciis, Slavicas appellationes substitueret, pro Alpha enunciando *Az*, pro Beta seu Vita Vjedi, interposito tamen *Buki*, quod Latinorum B respondet," &c.

There are two even of these alphabets, differing from each other in the form of the letters, although both are in nearly the same degree allied to the Greek alphabet. But the Illyrian alphabet of Jerome in the thirteenth century has scarcely a vestige remaining of the Greek forms, unless it be pi and phi. The other letters, though still retaining the same order, fixed by their retaining the same value as numerals, are studiously varied from the Greek letters, and far more complicated in their forms: the numerals in both being thrown back one letter after 2, by the introduction of the additional letter *Buki*.

Now, the Arabic, Amharic, and Sanscrit alphabets seem to have the same kind of connection with each other, and the same common derivation from Hebrew which these three Slavonic alphabets have with each other, and which we know to be derived from the Greek: and we must consider what are the most charac-

teristic peculiarities of these oriental alphabets. The first peculiarity common to them all, and totally different from European usages, has reference to the vowels, for each one of which we have a distinct letter, which is used like any other letter and incorporated among the consonants; while in Hebrew and Arabic the vowels are expressed by points placed above or below the letters: and in Amharic and Sanscrit they are expressed by little horns and flourishes joined on to the letters above or below—on one side or on the other. We regard this feature as indicative of a fundamental principle common to these oriental alphabets, and connecting them together and separating them from all our western alphabets by an impassable barrier: and while the Arabic comes nearest to the Hebrew, as using points for this purpose in common with it, the Sanscrit is the most remote from it, and would have no apparent connection with it, save by the intervention of the Amharic, which has confessedly borrowed largely both from Hebrew and Arabic, and in which we may trace the commencement both of that system of incorporation of vowels with consonants, and that arrangement of sounds according to the organs of speech, which was carried in both respects to such a degree of perfection in the Sanscrit; and we have reason to believe that even in the Sanscrit it took place by successive steps; for there are not wanting indications, some of which are referred to by Kircher, of an older arrangement of the letters of the alphabet, not differing from the Hebrew order, and of an older and simpler form of character—less different than the present from the Amharic letters:—

"Nor can I help believing (says Sir W. Jones), although the polished and elegant Davanagari may not be so ancient as the monumental characters in the caverns of Jarasandha, that the square Chaldaic letters, in which most Hebrew books are copied, were originally the same, or derived from the same prototype, both with the Indian and Arabian characters; that the Phoenician, from which the Greek and Roman alphabets were formed by various changes and inversions, had a similar origin, there can be little doubt; and the inscriptions at Canarah seem to be compounded of *Nagari* and *Ethiopic* letters, which bear *a close relation to each other*, both in the mode of writing from the left hand and in the singular manner of *connecting the vowels with the consonants*. These remarks may favour an opinion entertained by many, that all the symbols of *sound* had *a common origin:* the symbols of *ideas*—(that is, hieroglyphics as contradistinguished from alphabets)—now used in China, and formerly in Egypt and Mexico, *are quite of a distinct nature*" (*Asiatic Res.* 124.)

And thus it appears that it is not so much in the facts that

we are at issue with Sir W. Jones, but only in the understanding and true import of those facts, and in the inferences which are to be drawn from them. We do not believe that any alphabet was written in the *European* method, or *in a direction from left to right*, until after the time when this change took place in writing Greek; and we therefore place the origin of the Amharic and Sanscrit alphabets later than the Coptic; and we think that the knowledge of letters reached India through Egypt and the Red Sea at that time. The Amharic numerals are the letters of the alphabet in the Coptic order, just as the Arabs used at first the Hebrew order of letters for numeration; but both in the Arabic and in the Amharic a different order of letters was adopted for *grammatical* purposes, which was at length perfected into the very refined system of classification found in the Devanagari. On the other hand, the Sanscrit seems to have possessed from a very early period the use of *cyphers* instead of *letters* for numeration and arithmetical calculations; and to India the world is apparently indebted for this important invention, which did not reach Europe until the Arabs brought it with them in their invasion of Spain. And we can scarcely conceive it possible that the knowledge of figures could have been withheld from any people to whom the Sanscrit language was imparted; and that it thus becomes highly probable that the language itself was confined to India, and not imparted to any other people.

The only written character which we can find throughout the East, older than the Arabic and the Greek, is the arrow-headed character of Persepolis, Babylon and Nineveh—three varieties of one kind of writing. The latest of these forms, the Persian, has been in part decyphered by Major Rawlinson, in an inscription of the age of Darius Hystaspes: and we are inclined to think, from the clumsy and tedious way in which words are written in these characters, that this was not the original purpose to which the arrow-heads were applied, but an awkward accommodation. However this may be, the arrow-headed characters spread no further: no ingenuity can deduce any known alphabet from arrow-heads. The Mongols were destitute of letters, as were the Tartars of the North of Asia; and, like the Parthian hordes before them, learned the use of letters from the nations they overran, in whatever direction their route might happen to lie; and the Greeks of the age of Xenophon had carried their language to the court of Persia itself.

Our convictions, therefore, remain the same, for the east as for the west, that the Hebrew alphabet is the source from whence all other alphabets are derived; and it may be as well

to repeat an opinion which we have on other occasions asserted, that the square form of the Hebrew alphabet is unquestionably the original form, and not the barbarous Samaritan; but, on the other hand, the spoken dialects of mankind cannot be traced to any one source, though they may be classed together into groups, so as to be traced to one or other of the seventy families into which mankind was divided by the confusion of tongues at Babel. The three great branches also of the posterity of Noah settled, each one according to its families, in the several quarters of the earth; the posterity of Shem spreading to the eastward and southward, that of Japhet to the European regions, and that of Ham towards Africa from Armenia. But subsequent migrations have so far modified these original settlements of mankind that the present geographical distribution of nations is no guide at all for discovering their connection with each other, or ascertaining to which of the sons of Noah they should be traced: yet, speaking of Europe as a whole, we may safely say that the major part of its inhabitants are of the family of Japhet, and form the predominant race of mankind.

And among the European nations England unquestionably holds at present the foremost place; and manifests it still more strikingly now, in the quiet grandeur of standing still unmoved and unharmed, when every other nation of Europe has been shaken to its foundations and so many crowned heads have tottered in their seats, than even when she stood alone against the whole world in arms against her. This distinction is not due to martial prowess alone; or wealth resulting from ships, colonies, and commerce alone; or to the internal prosperity secured by a well ordered Constitution and equally administered laws; but it is due to that which lies at the root of all these —an original strength of character—beginning in the boy and, by right improvement of his opportunities, preparing for the efficient discharge of the duties of manhood; and by every man minding the duties of his own place, or profession, or rank in life, expecting others to mind theirs: and, above all, it is due to that fear of God which has been an especial characteristic of the English people. This is the beginning of wisdom, and this is the means of procuring the divine blessing. They that honour God are honoured of him—they that despise God shall be lightly esteemed.

God hath preserved a witness for the truth upon earth in all former ages—in the Hebrew language and in the Jewish people in times of old, and, as we would fain hope, in the English language and people at the present day. What he hath already done for us is an encouragement to hope for the time to come.

We entertain the belief that it is not for a light purpose we have been brought through so many perils, or that the possessions of England should encircle the globe and our name should be known and respected in every port of the world-wide ocean. All these privileges have not been bestowed upon us for nought and in vain; but they are given as so many means and opportunities of glorifying God and preparing, by the spread of the Gospel, for the kingdom of heaven.

And the cultivation of the English language thus becomes an object of paramount importance to us, not only on account of the past reminiscences connected therewith, but for present application and for a brilliant future yet lying in prospect before us; and conquests of the intellect—triumphs of spirit—to be achieved, not by the sword, but by the tongue and by the pen. Hæ tibi erunt artes, we may say of England in contradistinction to the dominion of force on which the Roman power was based: though the result may be that the once universal Latin language should be supplanted by English.

In this point of view it becomes especially interesting to trace the broad foundation of ancient dialects on which the modern English language has been constructed, as it thereby is rendered capable of becoming the medium of communication with so much larger a number of the different families of mankind than any language restricted to one dialect alone could possibly be made. And if the propagation of our language be the expression of Christian benevolence and actuated throughout by a Catholic, tolerant, and inclusive spirit—if its effects be to spread the knowledge of the truth and diffuse the arts of civilization—if its results tend to colonize distant lands, to explore unknown continents in the extremities of the earth, and sow the seeds of other nations there—if, in so doing, the desert portions of the globe are rescued from the wild beast, so that the wilderness shall rejoice and blossom as the rose—then, will not such an unity of speech be a counteraction of the purpose of God: it will be forwarding the accomplishment of his purposes: it will not be to prevent the dispersion of mankind but to fill the world with inhabitants: it will not have the nature of the sin of Babel, and will not have cause to apprehend a Babel's curse.

Mr. Welsford's first work takes a very wide survey of language, in general, in tracing the origin and ramifications of the English; and it manifests, not only learning and research, but a philosophic mind: it suggests more than is expressed, and is full of matter which will well repay the effort of patient investigation and thoughtful and repeated perusal. Our chief difference with Mr. Welsford is on the place which the Sanscrit

language holds: he places it earlier in time, and gives it a more prominent and more dominant position among languages than we have been accustomed to assign it, which is our excuse for having enlarged on this point.

Dr. Bosworth is most at home in the Scandinavian languages and literature, and only touches incidentally on the Oriental questions; but, on this very account, his publications are highly interesting, and we had almost said indispensable; for we know no other works which contain the same kind of information presented in so good a form. Dr. Bosworth has paid great attention to the differences produced in the same language by difference of dialect, which he maintains is not owing to ignorance or barbarism, but to differences in the organs of speech; and, consequently, that original words which have been lost in one dialect may often be recovered by means of another. He illustrates this in English by specimens of the dialects of Lancashire, Devon, &c.

In Frisian, Icelandic, and foreign languages, Dr. Bosworth has obtained the assistance of the best native scholars he could engage to examine what he has written on their several languages, the knowledge of which fact gives us the greater confidence in his general accuracy; and his Anglo-Saxon dictionary is a work which was greatly wanted, for those already published, being both bulky and scarce, were beyond the reach of readers in general; and, in the increasing attention which is now being given to these branches of enquiry, a dictionary was required which should be, at the same time, portable and sufficiently full and accurate.

The age of pedantry is, we trust, past for ever; and we hope that no more will be heard of the fopperies of antiquated spelling or the revival of obsolete words and phrases. But the more we investigate the true nature of our language, and the sources from whence both its substance and enrichments have been derived, the more we shall be able to increase both its strength and its polish, and make it thus a suitable receptacle and channel for the ever-growing varieties and refinements of this intellectual age. As science itself enlarges, the language for imparting it must enlarge, and the action of each is reciprocal and reflective: improved science advances language, and improved language tends to the advancement of science. A wise man will not seek for a new word when there is an old word at hand which fully expresses his meaning; but a wise man will restrict the words he uses, as far as possible, to *one sense*; and *things* which were previously *unknown* cannot be named correctly in *words* already *known*.

ART. IX.—*Mr. Disraeli's Speech on the Labours of the Last Session.* London: Painter. 1848.

THE close of the late session demands attention from us for several reasons. Probably, in modern history, there is nothing that can readily find a parallel with it, no less for the length of its duration, the inordinate quantity of debate within and comment without, than from the melancholy and meagre results which characterized it. The mountain in labour has often been adduced to exemplify those events where much has been threatened and "little done, and that little done badly;" but the mountain which brought forth a mouse was certainly more to be marvelled at, in everywise, than a session lasting little short of a year, which is remarkable for its lamentable vacillation and want of energy, and out of which are elaborated only a few abortive bills which are, to the imminent cases in hand, about as useful as carrying coals to Newcastle or skates to the West Indies.

An interminable quantity of "talk" night after night gives to a man, at the least, a liberal reputation for prosiness; but this is logic in a circle: the repetition of the same facts and arguments begin to weary those who look on when they behold the disastrous results of a Ministry hesitating what to do between inadequacy to meet the pressure of affairs and a perpetual recurrence to "*feeling the pulse*" of the people, in order to ascertain whether the screw cannot be turned a little tighter, and so save the country by expediency.

Certainly, a Ministry, called together at the commencement of the session, could not fail to be struck at the immense labour which lay before them: for years nothing in comparison to that crisis had appeared—nothing of such perilous magnitude had ever demanded the attention of statesmen. A commercial panic—nay, it had grown beyond a panic and taken the semblance of an actual fact—appeared, and men were paralyzed as they beheld the crumbling ruins around them. Day by day increased the disastrous news. Firms of the stablest kind, names that were as a tower of a strength, gave way beneath the irresistible influence of the torrent of ruin which ran through the extent of the land. The merchant and the trader, the manufacturer and the shopkeeper, all fared alike; but the effect of these, individually, was to add an enormous aggregate to the distress of the people. Lack of employment and scarcity of gold increased pauperism; and we were then in almost as bad a position as Ireland was a short while back—we had none whose liberal hands might aid us but the hand of God. How

we got through it we can scarcely tell; but in the *Gazette*, whoever chooses to look it over, will be found a fearful chronology of private misery and the almost total overthrow of public credit: it is one bulletin of insolvency—one universal bankruptcy pervaded all and characterized all: and *this*, too, is the more remarkable, inasmuch as the period of depression was immediately succeeding one of prosperity.

When the currency is encumbered, or rather gyved, with Banking Acts of such distracting kinds that it is at one moment judged convenient to infringe or violate the law under the plea of emergency—and when the sanctioners of this infringement rejoice that such was *not* done because a providential interposition had made that unnecessary, and thus relieved them from a responsibility that was anything but reputable—what faith can be put in the promises of such a Ministry? What hope can we entertain of their aid in a perilous crisis, when even the proposed assistance is of so dangerous a nature. Save us from our friends, we say, in such an event! And, in addition, we may deduce that the reckless principle of free trade, and in particular the pernicious propagandism of those of the Manchester school, would overthrow the equal scales of fair and honest trading; and the first bad season, limiting the supply of food, would try these said free trade measures to their utmost: they were, therefore, tried and found wanting.

The Ministry, beholding this terrible disorganization, were called upon some months earlier than usual to look instantly into the evil and in somewise to remedy it—to remedy it how they could—patched and tinkered as these crazy matters had been before by bills whose inanity developed only more the imbecility of their concocters—immediately set to work, and the question of their labours is the history of the session, and it is upon that head we are about to offer our strictures.

Mr. Disraeli's able and spirited reply at the close of the session, in which a castigation as severe as it was merited is inflicted upon the Premier and his party, is before us now; and in this speech is recorded the "sayings and doings" of about ten months of misrule; for to end *thus*, as they have done, leaving us in the same predicament for any aid we have received from them—what is it but misrule?

At a time when men were looking to the Government for aid, either by the suspension of the Bank Act or by some sleight of hand devised by Sir Robert Peel or Sir Charles Wood—the latter characterised as "the worst financier that ever disgraced the memory of Cocker"—at a time, we say, when men, for lack of work, were becoming Chartists, Revolutionists,

or any other "ists"—when the factories were either shut up or only partially at work—when the forges in the iron districts were blown out and the colliery and the pottery contributed their quota of tumult and disorder—when the completion of several railways loosed a vast number of "navvies" upon the land and added to the general alarm—at the very period when Ireland was howling out for "bread" or blood and the repeal of the union—the Prime Minister brought forward in the house his budget, by which, with a deficiency of *three millions!* and an increased expenditure in prospect—military, naval, and miscellaneous, which would swell the debts of the nation—those without the house, who trusted that *now* at least they were to have aid given them, were thunder-stricken, paralyzed, amazed, when they were told that, instead of receiving the immediate help they counted upon, the income-tax was to be *increased!* Thus, men who were on the very verge of bankruptcy, and whose fall this disgraceful attempt at further imposture only hastened, were comforted! Mr. Disraeli thus cuttingly comments upon it:—

"I am using no term of exaggeration if I express the feeling of the house, after hearing that budget, as one of considerable dissatisfaction. Every hon. gentleman who represented a party or a section rose (almost even behind the Treasury bench) and expressed an indignant protest against the Government scheme. But this was only a murmur compared with the roar which took place out of doors. A menagery before feeding-time could alone give an idea of the unearthly yell with which the middle classes—especially the inhabitants of towns—especially the advocates of liberal opinions—and more especially the disciples of free-trade principles—met this demand. Day after day Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and Bradford sent up their protests: meetings were held in the city of London at which the scheme was condemned; and persons were, in fact, so much alarmed that they had not time to investigate the causes of their condition; but there was a general impression that the income-tax was about to be doubled because we were going to war!"

This odious tax was imposed by Sir Robert Peel upon the nation with plausibility, and certainly with something like clever State craft: to be swindled cleverly has a sort of saving clause in it. The bitter pill was thus offered to us, and the plea of "necessity"—the assurance "that it was to be merely temporary"—had their weight. The pill was swallowed; and, not yet recovered from its effects, we were desired to swallow more! But the attempt to increase this burden—(a war-tax in times of peace, nothing more or less)—was rejected with one universal shout of indignation, and the Whig Ministry fell below par.

The maxim of the free-trader may be good enough for trade itself, but what is it for the workman? Who is it that is, after all, sacrificed in order that goods may be bought in the cheapest and sold in the dearest market? The home trade must perish, or all must be absorbed into the huge maelstrom of the capitalist, who devours all the smaller fry of the industrious poor shopkeepers in his path. The poorer classes, therefore, as the police reports testify but too frequently, are almost ground to the point of annihilation; and there is not a small master of any craft in England who is not a living testimony to this fact. The capitalist points to his factories, his mines, his smelting furnaces, to his railway undertakings, and says—"There is labour for all: we have called upon you to come and work—we are short-handed: therefore change your habits, your manners, and your occupations, and dig and delve, spin and weave, hammer and weld for us." Very fine all this, Messieurs the Free-traders; but how are you to do it? How are you to destroy the fabric of social life, and mould men in a new organization of labour of your own? Why, even the *ateliers nationaux* of Louis Blanc show as fair, if not a fairer, front: there is a maxim *there* which at all events shews an element of fair play, and it is, "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work." What have you done, therefore, but swollen the rank of the turbulent and the disaffected, and given a new impulse to the demagogue? To return to Mr. Disraeli, however—

"There is (he says) another cause alleged for the unsatisfactory state of public business, and that is, the forms of this house—the constitution of this house—which are now discovered to be cumbersome and antiquated, and to offer a great obstacle and barrier to the efficient, satisfactory, and speedy transaction of public affairs. This is the view of the case which is, I believe, principally relied on by her Majesty's Government."

This may be or may not be the truth. It is, however, a fact that institutions, modes, and fashions, which may have suited people at one time may not at another; and it is not at all improbable but that in some instances the Commons may be trammelled with a series of "forms" which they find cripples their motions and retards the advancement of public business, and, by consequence, the public interest. But that a full discussion of any important question, whatever be the time taken up by it, so that it is not wilfully and vexatiously opposed, does aught but good to the subject in hand, we must at once deny. Men cannot at once "jump to a conclusion" *pro* or *con;* and a deliberate argument tends to make converts to the wiser side, while it enlightens all.

The subjects recommended in the Queen's speech are proved not to have received that consideration due to them; and if, after nearly ten months of certainly hard but fruitless labour, all is found to be barren as ever, and "nothing is but what is not"—a paradox, by the bye, which, at all events, expresses the empty results of the whole—what does it shew to us but the utter incapacity of those in power to cope with the obstacles, gigantic enough, we must acknowledge, which lie before them; but which at the same time give men the opportunity of shewing what energy there is in them? "It is *not* advisable" (says Mr. Disraeli, with a mordacity under which the Premier must have winced) that a Minister should bring forward a project of change, unless he is able to carry his measure;" and in this opinion we perfectly concur, for what is failure but defeat? And what is defeat to a Minister disappointed in the carrying out of a favourite scheme but dishonour? Few men, after the memorable failure in the income tax, would have held office longer: it was very significant—that opposition; but Lord John is a casuist, and, like *Othello's* wife, can "turn and turn again."

Other reasons also are given in order to account for this state of affairs—some of them grave and some frivolous: among which is one that accuses the members of the house of holding to omuch discussion, of making too many speeches and nothing in them—being pretty much like *Bassanio's* wit—the marrow of them is as a grain of corn in a bushel of chaff, which, when found, is not worth the trouble taken in the searching. It has been found in many instances—extraneous though they be, yet they form a case in point—that when a person is allowed a limited time for speaking, particularly if it be the discussion of some important topic, that much of that time is frittered away in a rambling exordium; so that before the subject in hand is at all touched the time allowed is gone by, and it may be said to be wasted.

There appears, therefore, to be a negative at once placed upon discussion by the half-hour or the hour; for, as a man begins to open any question before him, it is easy to conceive how it broadens and widens out—how it derives a new importance from new facts brought forward in connection with it—how it is seen by the orator himself in a new point of view more clearly developed, and, as a matter of course, it is the more vividly pourtrayed; and, therefore, to limit a man's time, under such circumstances, is to cripple the intellect, and to leave an impression of barrenness which is disheartening and discouraging in no small degree.

Mr. Disraeli asks, therefore, whether certain questions of paramount importance have been too much discussed—whether time has been wasted upon them—whether, in fact, there has been time enough given to them—and whether they have not, in some instances, been disposed of with an indecent haste which deprived them of their value. And because the Ministry chose to mangle matters that are of too vast importance for their intelligence, in order to go smoothly on with things of minor or of no importance whatever, the evil still exists, and the Premier, on the principle of abusing, first speaks in such-wise:—"Here we are, at the 30th of August, and nothing done: it is you, gentlemen, opposite, by your factious and malignant opposition, who have wasted the public time and destroyed the health of the Government—on you alone the responsibility rests."

Meanwhile, Mr. Disraeli hearing this, and being concerned that the weakly Government, like a "peaking" child, should totter and fall, as represented by its wet-nurse, turns round upon the Premier; and, while vindicating the Commons of England, discharges a merciless volley of retaliation, mingled with caustic wit, sarcasm, and such bitter home truths, that certainly Lord John must have wished he had held his peace. It is an act of great folly to annoy bees; but if you pull a hornet's nest about your ears, wo be to you; for folly, like virtue, is its own reward.

Perhaps also we had this session more committees and harder work, amounting, in some instances, to eighteen hours a-day, than during any *ten* preceding ones. The labours of the House of Commons have been very great; and had *they* not been checked by the Government—and not the Government by them—the session would not have ended so unsatisfactorily as it has done; nor would the Whig Ministry have been looked upon with eyes both jealous and distrustful. Delay and temporising have placed them on the verge of dissolution, and they have held together by the attraction of affinity, and not of gravity.

In the course of the observations which fell from Mr. Disraeli, there is one which is very pregnant with meaning, on the right of petition, and on the attention which is bestowed upon petitions in general. The following words will become memorable:—

"Here I would make one observation on these petitions, since considerable error exists out of doors among our constituents on the subject. There is an idea that the presentation of a petition is an empty form—that it is ordered to lie on the table and is never heard

of again. Now, it is as well that our constituents should know that *every petition laid on the table is scrutinised by a select committee of the most experienced and influential members of this house*—that every petition, which, from the importance of the subject or the ability of its statements appears to merit more particular notice, is printed at the public cost and afterwards circulated among the members; and I believe that at this moment the right of petition (although it is not permitted to make speeches on every petition) is a more important and efficient right than has been enjoyed at any time by the people of England in this respect."

This disabusing the people of a vulgar error has a value that we must not think too lightly of; for when men goaded with misery and with wrongs, imaginary or real, have an idea that they who legislate for them merely jog on and pass Acts to punish and not to prevent—make poor-laws to heighten and not measures to mitigate the pain of the foodless and the houseless—when men, we say, run away with this idea, it requires but a demagogue to change disaffection into insurrection—to make the royalist a revolutionist. Let them but imagine for an instaut that their cries are listened to with apathy and their grievances with contempt, and you sow in their hearts the black, bitter, and inextinguishable feelings which now exist between the poor and the rich, and which you may repress with the bayonet, but you cannot prevent those pent feelings from seething into a silent and implacable rage; nor can all you say or do prevent the assassin or the fire-raiser from executing his purpose the first opportunity that offers.

The present has been hitherto a most portentous year, and we have in every way been concerned in its events. Let us then take a glance over the moral map of Europe, and endeavour to trace the origin and course of our circumstances.

The very week in which the Premier's remarkable budget was placed upon the table, and so unceremoniously thrust to one side, the last French Revolution took place. The overthrow of public credit had so far spread abroad among the people that, like a terrible epidemic, their long-subdued ferocity broke forth. Starving men in England swore by the "five points," and the operative was ready to become an insurgent. The hewers of wood and the drawers of water had been goaded by misrule, and the harvest so sown by the free-trader, the capitalist, and the absentee, ripened into the whirlwind. In France, the people looked for a short time around them in order to find a reason for a "pretty quarrel;" and the suppression of some popular journals, together with the insensate and unaccountable attempts to put down the Reform banquet, gave them a reason and a rallying cry. Once more, then, did the throne of the Bourbons

lie in the dust—once more did that race, doomed like the race of the Stuarts, become wanderers on the earth. Again did the pride of human power quail before the fiat and the frown of humanity, and the descendant of the Bearnois was driven forth, without striking a blow for his crown, into ignominious exile. Cobden had already fraternized with Cremieux; and the "free-trader" had the satisfaction of shortly finding his trans-La-Manche brother a member of the bonnet-rouge-club, which drove our English workmen, robbed of their property, out of France; and thankful to escape, even with life, from those civilized savages, they shook the dust from off their feet in testimony against them.

The crash of falling thrones was echoing over Europe: everything betokened a storm: the peaceful millennium that was ushered in by the halcyon days at the commencement of the year was swallowed up in the gloom of Erebus. The annihilation of monarchies was talked of as a thing of course, and comfortably chatted over at the street corners. With a pike and a match London was to be taken, and Australia was assigned as the new residence of the (to be) exiled Government of England: the Queen was to be deposed—Feargus O'Connor was to be the new *Norman* conqueror—while Smith O'Brien was to revive the old courts of Brian Boru at Dublin, and Lord Clarendon to be his first sworn vassal.

To speak in more solemn seriousness, however, there were more fearful phases in this revolutionary crisis than have been adduced. If it were only to show how bitter and black oppression and neglect can make the heart of man, immediate heed should have been given to the perils which so alarmed the minds of men. There were evils, real and ghastly, which haunted men, as did the furies of fable-mad Orestes. Famine was in Ireland, and, to a certain extent, in England—else, why did men, and women, and young children, die in the streets of the cities—on the roads—unless it was done purposely to annoy parish authorities and to settle the poor law question?

While all these mighty convulsions were shaking half the world, from old Thule to the Black Sea, and rumours of wars were coming from beyond—while dynasties were losing their sacred character—while Lamartine became first great and then small—while the Austrian—(Rodolph of Hapsburgh would surely move in his stone coffin if monkish legends ran true)—was preparing for flight—and the Bavarian was dallying his time and risking his crown with a woman of questionable virtue—while the Johannisberg of the greatest of foreign diplomatists was going down the rude throats of the peasants and Metternich

was far from the great tun of Heidelberg—while, in fact, the greatest events of a century were trembling in the balances of frivolity, heedlessness, and vice—it would almost seem that men forgot under what circumstances, and for what purposes, the Parliament met!

It happened, as in times of old, when the wrathful scourges of God lashed the nations, that the fiat had gone forth and "there was famine in the land." In Ireland—where the ground is blessed with a greenness and fertility that the islands of the south seas may only surpass—there was an utter destruction of that particular food which, unhappily before then and now, is the staple on which its cottars depend for support. The efforts which the men of England then made, paralleled only by the energies of the Roman people in the days of the old Republic, were so great as to cripple our own means, and thereby leave us in the position of people who have given charity with so unsparing a hand that we forgot the trite and wholesome adage that "charity begins at home;" and, in consequence, we suffered to an incredible degree—the commercial crisis was precipitated with a force and ruinous impetuosity almost incredible.

While foreign thrones, some tottering and others dislodged, were trembling upon the unsteady surface, and monarchs were dropping off into obscurity, like the fabled passengers in the vision of Mirza, the one class, who had influence and wealth, and through whom myriads of the labouring classes had employment, were at a stand-still. In England it was little better than it was in Ireland: men whose names were spotless and unsullied—"gentlemen (as Mr. Disraeli says) whom we had lived with in this house and whom we respected and regarded —merchants of the highest European reputation—were during that crisis rudely torn, I may say, from these benches, if not with disgrace and dishonour, yet with circumstances of pitiable vicissitude seldom equalled." This was the case when the danger of merchant and trader was of an unexampled kind. Her Majesty had said that she had "seen, with great concern, the distress which had for some time prevailed among the great commercial classes:" the Queen betrayed a depth of feeling in her speech which reflects credit upon her humanity. We ask (with Mr. Disraeli), "was there too much discussion on this momentous question?"

Then followed the singular episode of the Banking Bill, about which there was more dubiety than consisted with its respectability; and, what was worse, a complete failure of the very questionable plan on which its suspension (illegal or not) was to work. It was set aside, and the business was arranged without it; for the British merchant has in some shape or other an

[illegible]—a kind of elasticity about him that, [illegible] apathy, brings him through difficulties [illegible] statesmen quail.

The [illegible] budget was expatiated upon by the hon. gen[illegible] Mr. Disraeli with as much happiness of epigram as [illegible] and force of his comment. "We had (says he) [illegible] the Government of all the Talents;' which in [illegible] reminds one of the old comedy of '*Lingua*,' where [illegible] assumes the supremacy. "This (adds Mr. Disraeli) [illegible] of all the Budgets:" and there has been [illegible] than sense displayed in the equivocal manner [illegible] these budgets have been concocted and produced.

The [illegible] Disabilities Bill occupies another important item [illegible] and no one can accuse the members of much [illegible] on this subject. Whatever be our opinion upon the [illegible] we have an idea that, where the rights of any class or [illegible] are to be discussed, both time and talent should be de[illegible] Discussion enlightens the ignorant and adds [illegible] information of the wise; but we have known Maynooth [illegible] to have been made with scarcely anything amounting to [illegible] importance of a debate attending them.

During all this time, too, there was sown in the famished [illegible] land of Ireland the seeds of rebellion that only [illegible] the attention of Parliament, and was supposed to be snuffed out by the threats of the Premier as to what he would do, and by the equivocal squibs of the *Times*. Three or four several times, that powerful journal has assured us that the rebellion was only an *imbroglio* which would soon hide its diminished head, and suddenly it did so; but what advantage did we derive from that when we were called upon to look at Smith O'Brien in the cabbage-field or riding off with the policeman's horse? How is it that this article failed in its classical allusion, by forgetting to parallel the latter act with the astute Ulysses robbing Rhesus of his horses? Was this, after all, the way in which this matter should have been treated? Why point out the evil, and forgetting the smoul[illegible] dering of this bitter fire—this fever of outrage, [illegible] and robbery—omit to speak of the ulti[illegible] rest upon men's minds as to [illegible] once generated within [illegible] with life? Why [illegible] It is not [illegible] sparkli[illegible] ing it [illegible] that

[illegible] Premier's

attention. At the eleventh hour, Lord John did what ought to have been done at the fourth—nay, at the third, or second. Treason was tolerated till it grew into power, and the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus Act* only occurred when, from north to south, a Club-ramification had been constituted—an organization formed—which we fear will defy the efforts of the civil arm to check.

Rebellion has broken out again, and it would seem that, at O'Brien's trial, some autograph notes of the Premier's will be exhibited, and as a matter of course commented upon. We well remember the time when the Reform Bill was passed—when the Chartist had merged his "points" in its promising clauses: we remember when Lord John Russell, Lord Brougham, and Daniel O'Connell were a sort of triumvirate whose names the men of England and Ireland invoked: we well remember the agitation which the Premier caused, and the ferment that ensued, because he did then, as O'Connor did at the time we were threatened with a Chartist petition which would stupify Lords and Commons with its magnitude and its tail. "Advance men on to London (quoth he) in large masses—terrify the authorities and the legislature by a demonstration"—which was, after all, a lamentable failure. "Make an effort," was the constant advice of Mr. Dombey's sister to that proud and passionless man. "Make an effort," was the cry of Lord John to the operatives of England: they did so, and the Reform Bill was passed and—burked.

If nothing more were wanting to show us the imbecility of a leading member of the Cabinet, it is, beyond all, his conduct in this perplexing Irish row. We have as much contempt for its murderous, thankless, blustering, and miscreant character, as any of its most inveterate haters have. That the plot is deep-laid, and only requires means to equal its malignity, is but too certain. It is not a "political" movement, says the *Times*—it is agrarian. Then, wherefore are there courts to try them for high treason? And what does the word "agrarian" mean if the people are rising *en masse?* Is it an universal cattle-stealing or shoplifting? Are they bound to black mail and heifer-carrying like so many Hermeses going to steal the Apollonian kine? It is "political" or it is nothing. "The time is come!"—writes John O'Connell from Paris, because Louis Philippe had been dethroned. If his words had any meaning at all, it was not a meaning relating to any *agrarian* outrage. In general, the peasant wants but a little food and a little shelter: wherefore, then, those dark stern faces? Wherefore that vindictive gnashing of the teeth, and the play of those eyes whose gleam speaks of aught but cor-

diality? Why does a man lie in a ditch all night, with a rusty gun in his hand, if it is for no *more* than cattle-stealing?

We are not alarmists: thank God, we have not that kind of fear, which, when danger is absent, depreciates and laughs at it, in order to feel a corresponding increase of alarm in turn. In the present crisis of politics, when all nations are undecided and Ministers are a riddle even to themselves, it is necessary, at least, that men who think should not be guided altogether by what they are told; but should rather draw inferences themselves —should rather think and ponder—and draw from *facts*, as they relate to themselves, those conclusions which are most natural.

On the hint regarding the *Habeas Corpus Act*, and the renewal of the Alien Act, the Government showed an amazing amount of indecision. They did not exactly know what they would do, though each day brought news more alarming than the last; but, finally, they did what they were told to do, and matters were in some little degree better. In that instance Mr. Disraeli challenges the Government to point out any obstacle, any inconvenience, any objection offered them, although the working of it was in some degree unconstitutional. Yet necessity has no precedent —or rather makes precedents for herself. "On that occasion (pursues the writer) it was a model for any constitutional chamber in Europe." And certainly the noble boast was in no way either a falsehood or an exaggeration; but, if the Ministry know not their duty and throw obstacles in the way of the Commons, how can we expect but that confusion may be worse confounded?

We are not alarmists, we repeat: we do *not* say that the country is ruined or to be ruined, for that will not happen while Saint Paul's, *our* Colosseum, stands; but we, at the same time, say there was and there is danger—danger arising from such another session—danger from a want of a firmer Cabinet—danger from such a premiership, which is so blind to the evil and not competent to deal with it—when the evil is seen stalking over the country as Achilles strode in the field when Patrocles was slain. Lord John Russell went to Ireland—what for? It surely was not to be a pleasure-trip, with which we can have no business; because a man who has contributed in no small degree to augment the difficulties and dangers of the loyalists there can draw but little gratification at beholding his own work and its results.

He who can sit down and write a dim "Cause of the French Revolution" *may* have had a clear insight or otherwise into the politics of that nation; but we cannot accuse him of possessing an enlightened knowledge of our own. The bills he has tendered and abandoned—the schemes half built up and then de-

molished, like a castle of cards—the shabby make-shifts which prove only a fertility in cobbling—are not the things we look for in a Prime Minister of England. We look there for all that education, talent, genius, and experience can give a man, and the Premier should have had all these; but we do not look for that mortifying want of energy which has characterised the Ministry throughout.

Let the reader look back for the last ten months and tell us whether the exertions of more than seven hundred men, taken collectively, should not have produced us more than the scanty and most unsatisfactory harvest laid before us? If we are at peace with other nations, while they themselves are in a manner disembowelling themselves in an internecine war, we have not to thank those in power for it: we have had to congratulate ourselves upon a knowledge in what the true enjoyment of life consists, rather than in calculations upon the probable profits which the contractors for the commissariat would obtain; and, through them, the few artizans who work for next to nothing. Beneath the olive branch we sit in a more genial sunshine than any laurel can fling over us; and while we are no advocates for the "pomp and circumstance" of war, so are we also strenuous supporters of the cause of humanity, the rights of labour, and the improvement of all conditions.

Power we have to an extent almost unlimited—almost incredible; and, casting our eyes on the map of the globe, we find that this mere speck of land contains the vital blood which warms and cherishes those gigantic and straggling limbs which touch the bounds of the utmost seas. In America, interior and sea-board, the genius of English commerce has fixed her seat, and pours down the broad rivers its abundance. Between the two extremities of the new world, our colonies, mismanaged though they have been, still acknowledge alike the protection and the support of the mother country. To the north an impassable rampart of ice alone limits the sway of our commercial enterprise, aided by the dauntless exertions of the hardiest mariners the earth can boast of. We are possessors of a wealth which we return in a new but not less profitable manner. What conquest could ever have given us this? It may be replied that the arms of Britain have wrested from all possessors, both barbarian and foreign, nearly three-fourths of the gorgeous wealth of India; and that the despots of Hindostan are now the vassals of an English merchant country. However wonderful this may be, still it must be admitted that our arms have been called in requisition more to allay the fury of an outrageous barbarism than to add to the wealth of a robber horde.

At the extremity of the African peninsula the English flag is a protection to the negro, while it teaches its rude people the arts of civilization and the blessings of peace.

It may appear, after all, paradoxical that peace should depend upon the bayonet point; but surely a man is justified in using any violence to disarm a fanatic murderer, or in checking the diabolical cruelties of a people, with whom to shed blood was a test of manhood and slaughter an element of religion.

Complaints from the colonies, however, during this session, have been loud, frequent, and ominous. They were debated upon—but how? Expediency, even in those matters also, tested the ability of the Ministry, and made one more addition to the many failures of the Premier.

The times have been unstable: time carries very often its old instability with it; and, build your new mansion on the quaking ground ever so firmly, it is odds if the tremour will not be felt quivering through the ashlar walls. There is a general impression spreading among men that something is yet wanting —that all is not as it should be—though the diagnosis of the disease is only slightly apparent. The idea of reform of many things, scarcely nascent, is dimly shadowing itself forth to the minds of the thoughtful, though they have as yet had little utterance; but the stormy voice will at last issue forth—the struggling soul will speak out—and, fetter it as you will, the indomitable energy cannot be for ever unheeded—cannot be completely paralyzed, even by *four* budgets in one session.

What, then, is to be done?—Not to let men utter treason under the name of patriotism—not to buy the co-operation of a priesthood inimical to us, and who work against us in a base and underhanded manner—not to allow cargo after cargo of arms to quit the ports of England in order to be distributed in Ireland—not to allow the time of *action* to give place to discussion while every man in the country has his musket and his pike stowed away, and grins exultingly as he hands over his rusted weapon to the policeman's hand. Neither should the Ministry receive hints with a supercilious curl of the lip, in order to act upon those very suggestions afterwards. This is what must not be done: courage, firmness, and decision are the necessary elements which combine to form a power that would be respected, and supported within, and held in salutary awe without. We cannot have our Legislature laughed at, nor its agents brought into contempt; but what *can* we do when they will bring this upon themselves? Shall we say, "Get ye hence, and let us have better, wiser, men!" It is painful to break up a dream of power—to blow into thin air the bubbles of

a fanciful statesman, however iris-bright be the hues of that luminous spectrum. It is, after all, unpleasant that the cushions of St. Stephen should be found strewn with thorns; but we must not—we dare not—tolerate the blowing of bubbles when interests so vast are at stake.

If the Premier visit Ireland with an intention of seeing with his own eyes and hearing with his own ears the vices and virtues of a factious and turbulent people, it is to be hoped that he will be benefitted by such a trip, and if on his return we behold that he is convinced of the folly of some favourite Whig scheme which takes a medium, much in the same fashion of a "short cut" to save time and distance, we shall congratulate ourselves and him upon his change of views and the adoption of a new mode of action: we are satisfied that, in every way, all parties will be the eventual gainers. It is said that, as in gaming, those who win do so at the expense of those who lose, yet *here* is a case in point where all are gainers; and, in the long run, even the factious, the dishonest, and the fierce and fearless demagogue, when brought to his senses, will perceive his advantage and will end by acknowledging it.

If success be the test of ability—if obstacles are removed and difficulties are surmounted while the causes of such fearful descriptions as have visited us are no more to be witnessed—what, then, must we think of a complete failure in all of these?

In pinning our faith upon the sleeve of a Prime Minister, be he who he may, we after all hang but upon a loose hook. One cannot, and another will not, aid us in a moment when we are in a manner perishing. We have for awhile lost sight of that self-reliance which, to a great extent, will make us independent of all such factitious and questionable aid; and when, after all, those who trusted so fondly in the calm weather through which the vessel of the Constitution was to sail, now behold the blackening sea with a fierce and ferocious howl rend the planks and scatter the cargo and threaten to swallow up our valuable freight, are we to sit down in a stupor of apathy and say, "Useless all our endeavours—we have naught remaining, and the last star is dead in the sky?" Not so. The still small voice comes to man, even in his darkest hour, in his greatest extremity. "Arise! and faint not; look abroad, and behold the indestructible energy which animates all things. Hope and faith—those bright twin harbingers of success—are around thee and before thee." And thus we press on, for what cannot be done at one time will be accomplished at another; and we, therefore, trust that a better destiny will dawn for us than has been brought to our homes and hearths this stormy year.

It is in this spirit that we do not utter the sweeping condemnation which rests upon our lips—on the tips of our pen. Seeing how decrepid and helpless (like an old grandsire who happens never to have been highly respected) this imbecile Ministry crawls to its dissolution, we are in a mood to part from it with a feeling of pity, for we may pity those who force us to hold them in contempt; and, though a sentiment of anger at its absurd obstinacy—at its immense obtuseness—has now and then crossed us, yet we forgive it. We bid it adieu! We are willing that it should sit down in the snug chimney-corner and take no more trouble in the affairs of the world: at the most, we would beg of it as a particular favour not to trouble itself about matters which concern us and others—nay, all men generally. But it so happens that, like old people who have an obstinate determination to do you all manner of services which lead to annoyance and error—playing a ruinous game—one who, in his servile generosity, expends the money belonging to other people and who may thereby be ruined—it is with this feeling that we implore them to "let well alone," and to give place to a Ministry on whose energies, talents, and straightforward method of doing work we *can* depend.

Our limits will not allow us to dilate further upon this topic, so fruitful in variety and so dreary to look upon. With more hopeful eyes we gaze upon the future, and trust that there we may find what we have so long vainly sought. By the blessing of God, WHO hath guarded our beloved land, our sovereign, and our liberties so far—WHO hath prevented the fearful propagandism of base and designing men from taking root among our leal-hearted people—we may look towards the next session with greater joy, and behold that what has been wanting or wrong in *this* may be remedied in *that*. In conclusion, we add that Mr. Disraeli's vindication of the members of the House of Commons is noble, manly, and complete.

Notices of Books.

Germany, England, and Scotland; or, the Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D.D. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1848.

We do not think that the work before us will add much to the literary reputation of Doctor Merle d'Aubigné. There is a promise, both in the title and the size of the volume, which is scarcely redeemed by the contents; and, though the manner in which the doctor handles his subject is very amiable, still there is not so much of originality as we have a right to expect from the name of the author and the matter with which he deals. It is said of a celebrated wit, who has but recently passed from the stage of mortal existence, that, having made a successful literary effort,* he feared to damage the reputation which he had acquired by any after-production of a feebler character. To what extent his modesty belied his talent it is not for us to say; but he was deeply read, and reasoned from an experience for which the records of authorship furnish ample materials. It would be well if more were as wise as he. This is a bookselling age, and there is a gaping maw for information which only a teeming press can satisfy. It follows that sometimes quantity, and not quality, will be the rule of production, and a division of profits be of more value in the estimate of the writer than his fame. No doubt, where this is the case, it tends in the end to a ruinous result: still the progress to the result has its fascinations, and there are some who, having made a lucky hit, will live on the produce till they become bankrupt. It is not uncommon to find men by a concentrated effort of genius writing themselves into reputation, and then, by rapidly succeeding works—too hastily composed to be sound and too desultory to be valuable—losing, by slow degrees, the name which they have suddenly acquired. We warn Dr. Merle d'Aubigné of this fate. He must write less or better. Every one was pleased with his "History of the Reformation:" even those who denied him the merit of accuracy acknowledged the graphic power of his style; whilst, with a very large portion of the reading world, his work became a text-book on a subject more generally discussed than understood. Then came his "Vindication of Cromwell"—a hasty work, full of historical inaccuracies and equivocal theology

* "Rejected Addresses."

—betraying, moreover, with an assumption of great impartiality, the strong prejudice of a partizan. And now we have the work before us—a step still lower; for, to the evidence of haste in its composition, it adds the mark of feebleness in its matter. Two or three more such steps, and Merle d'Aubigné will have outwritten the reputation which he so happily acquired.

More than two-thirds of this volume is taken up with "recollections," "travelling and historical," of Scotland. The "*travelling* recollections" of the author are briefly dispatched: his account of the land and the people do not occupy more than can be compressed within the compass of a chapter: a few pages are taken up with kindly and eulogistic notices of the several ministers, famous for their piety and talent, with whom he came in contact; and the rest of the space allotted to this part of his subject is used as a vehicle for the exposition of his own theological views. The *historical* recollections are neither more nor less than an abridged history of the religious struggle of the Scottish people with their rulers, from the days of Knox down to the secession of our own times, constituting what is called the "Free Church." An English reader will scarcely regard these recollections as a valuable addition to the literature of his land. As a summary of facts, too partially related to be represented in their true light, they will hardly serve the purposes of elementary study, much less satisfy the expectations which the nature of the subject and the name of the author naturally excited. Of the earlier periods discussed in these recollections we have already many excellent relations, which are not likely to be superseded or amended by the work before us; and, as far as mere information goes, there are some two hundred and upwards of its pages that might well have been dispensed with. The sins of Mary and the courage of Knox—the oppressions of prelacy and the sufferings of the Cameronians—are almost fire-side tales. As regards these our author adds little to our stock of knowledge; whilst many of us are not ignorant of the facts that, if Knox was bold, the rough-handed reformer was sometimes more rude than was seemly; and that if Covenanters were cruelly treated (as undoubtedly they were), they had certain wild notions of retributive justice which they sometimes put in practice. Of these facts Merle d'Aubigné says not a word. For instance, at the battle of Philiphaugh, one of the Covenanting preachers took his text from the fifteenth chapter of the first book of Samuel—"What meaneth this bleating of sheep in mine ears?"—and argued from it that the blood of the prisoners taken must be shed in order to appease the wrath of heaven. The consequence was that, of the "Ma-

lignants" taken in the action, the common soldiers were put to death in cold blood; and, of the officers eight, in deference to the importunity of the clergy, were condemned to execution. Bishop Honeyman was wounded by Preacher Mitchell in his attempt to assassinate the archbishop. Sharpe was murdered by Covenanters, who, at the time they met with the prelate, were lying in ambush for one Carmichael, a Government commissioner. These and similar facts are altogether omitted in the narrative before us; and we must qualify the recollections of a man who, amiable though he may be, only remembers so much of history as will favour a particular view, and only writes so much of it as will serve to strengthen that view in the minds of others. Truth is that which is most valuable to us in an historical narrative, and the suppression of a fact of any kind is in a proportionate measure destructive of the integrity of truth. The relation of a struggle between two parties, wherein, on the one hand, a continuous iniquity is presented to the mind, with nothing to account for its exercise but its own wantonness —wherein, on the other, unresisting suffering is placed before us, with nothing to provoke its infliction but its own meekness —will ever beget a doubt in the candid reader as to the impartiality of the author. If Merle d'Aubigné *will* write history after the model which he has followed in his later works, he must be prepared for this doubt—he must expect that those who are at all conversant with the periods of which he treats will either suspect the accuracy of his information or the purity of his motive. The battle of Philiphaugh was in 1645; the attempt of Mitchell on Sharpe, in which Bishop Honeyman was wounded, was in 1668; the murder of the archbishop in 1679. What our author calls "the killing time" embraces a period from 1681 to 1688. Is it too much to suppose that in the struggles of these unhappy times the brutality of the dominant party owed somewhat of its wantonness to the example of cruelty which an unrelenting bigotry had shown? If the murder of Archbishop Sharpe may be excused on the ground of the wrongs which he inflicted, surely the ferocities of the "killing time" may be traced in part to a spirit of retaliation. No one can deny the crimes of the royalist party—every right-minded man must abhor the cruelties of their persecutions; but common honesty requires that all the truth should be stated on both sides. Merle d'Aubigné is too partial to be truthful. The heading of his chapters betrays the *animus* with which he writes. "Curates and garrisons," "tyranny and indulgences," "the killing time," are bad imitations of a bad style: they may serve the purpose of one who desires to excite; but they are

beneath the dignity of one who wishes to profit and instruct. In his fierce onslaught upon every one and every thing which ever bore the name or came under the influence of a Stuart he is more than unjust. Every royalist is with him "a malignant;" the curates are "drunken vagabonds;" and he so writes his narrative as though it were impossible that either bigotry or intolerance should find a place in the constitution of the covenant or the breast of a covenanter.

With respect to the struggle on the *veto* question, Merle d'Aubigné has little to tell us that is new. The facts are within the cognizance of most of his readers; and we think that they will scarcely bear our author out in the character of patient endurance and tolerant love which he ascribes to those who constituted the secession. It doubtless numbered amongst its leaders men for whom common eulogy is too feeble; but, as *a whole*, it presented many unchristian characteristics. There was a great principle to be upheld, and unshaken courage was manifested in its maintenance: there was a great sacrifice to be made, and a noble fortitude was shown in making it: still we cannot forget the acrimonious spirit exhibited towards the party which had been left behind, nor the aggressive and unchristian mission which was organized against the English Church.

We have first noticed that portion of this work which treats of Scotland, because it is, both in bulk and matter, by far the most important. Of social England and her hospitalities the doctor writes most kindly: he rejoices in her high moral and religious standing, and freely criticises, as he has full right to do, her ecclesiastical institutions. It is plain, however, that of the spirit of the English Church, and the character of the English clergy as a body, he is hardly a competent judge: he comes to this judgment with a preconceived notion of his own as to what is theologically excellent, and measures every thing by it. Of this we complain. Merle d'Aubigné assumes that the views which he himself holds are essentially the views of theological truth—that of their correctness there can be no possible question—and that any dissent from them must of necessity be the maintenance of an error: he constantly refers to the authority of Scripture (we reverently admit the principle)—he assumes his own interpretation to be unquestionably correct; and, whilst standing on this imagined "vantage-ground," he asserts dogmatically and passes judgment as though it were not possible to dispute his authority or appeal from his sentence. Yet his theological views of Catholic truth are neither definite, deep, nor comprehensive. They are comprised within the limits of a personal experience. What is necessary to the sal-

vation of an individual he knows—(on this point we should humbly hope there can be no dispute)—but as to what is proper to the constitution of a Church—what attaches to the symbolization of scriptural types—what belongs to the interpretation of prophecy—what, in all the mighty fulness of their signification, is involved in the priestly, prophetical, and kingly offices of our blessed Lord—on all these points his views seem to us feeble and inadequate—measuring, indeed, no further than the narrowest limits of a Genevan theology will allow. We are quite aware that what is contained within this compass meets the spiritual comprehension and measures the faith of many; but we are much mistaken if it is sufficient to constitute any man a competent judge of what alone is theologically excellent, or to give him authority in settling the rules of scriptural interpretation. Again, we have to complain that, though our author continually asserts the authority of Scripture as conclusive, he never definitely applies it to any particular point or case so as to ensure conviction: in most instances his applications are vague and beside the mark—in many positively erroneous. This fact in itself damages the claim to authority in judgment which is everywhere tacitly assumed by our author; and we are reluctantly compelled, in ascertaining the value of his views, to contrast the amount of dogmatism in assertion with the amount of feebleness in exposition.

We do Merle d'Aubigné no injustice in remarking that, in his estimation, there is no such perfect form of Church constitution and government as that which Geneva furnishes. We think he makes this manifest everywhere. It is very natural that he should arrive at this conclusion; but it is one that unfits him to judge of the claims of the English Church. We cannot quite agree with him that episcopacy is, after all, little better than a theological decency, to be tolerated as a sort of ecclesiastical covering which the weakness or the prejudice of some would seem to require; and yet, until we assent to this proposition, as a thing of course, we are not in a condition to admit the correctness or the value of his deductions. Merle d'Aubigné will have no king but Christ—neither will we: but, in his interpretation of this kingship, he so deals with abstractions as to become a Radical in matters of Church government. As a natural consequence, though, perhaps, unconsciously to himself, he betrays in all his political reasonings that his sympathies are republican. It is impossible, therefore, that he can fully understand the nature of the English Church; for, in its constitution and doctrine, it is essentially opposed to the lawlessness which delights in self-government in the Church, and which abates the just

foundation of authority in the State. Again: Merle d'Aubigné is acquainted with an estimable but particular portion of the English clergy, and he therefore assumes that he has a competent knowledge of the whole as a body. Now, we esteem and love as Christian brethren those whom he admires; but we are far from supposing, as he would seem to infer, that there are neither piety, spiritual intelligence, nor devotion, out of the circle which he has circumscribed: he rings the usual popular changes upon that unhappy word "Puseyism," and fastens it upon all who, manifesting any life at all, do not manifest it exactly in the forms which are a model to himself. He says:—"The worldliness of the clergy has long been a general complaint in England." The worldliness of the clergy, notwithstanding all their faults—and they are many—is, we venture to assert, less in amount than that which will be found in any body of men of similar profession and like numbers. Merle d'Aubigné, doubtless, from this charge excludes those with whom he sympathizes; but, in the distinctions which he draws, he seems strangely ignorant of the fact that what he calls "Evangelicalism" has its Exeter Hall dissipations, as ruinous to the spirit as the gaieties of the unprofessing; and that there is many a selfish form in which evangelical popularity is turned to the purposes of temporal profit. He knows the clergy as he has seen them in large towns and on public platforms: if he wishes to learn the pastoral character of the English clergy, these are not the places in which he will best ascertain it. He says again that "the love of liturgical and architectural forms is another subject of general complaint against the clergy in England." The love of liturgical forms a matter of complaint! From whom? To complain that the clergy have a love of liturgical forms is to complain that they are conscientiously attached to that portion of Christ's Church of which they are the ordained ministers. The complaint is made by those who do not love the Church of England. To abstract the grounds of it, the English clergy must give up their faith or their conscience. In either case, we make a present of them to the doctor. As regards their love of architectural forms, we will leave others to deal with the author: it is a subject the merits of which are not to be exhausted in a sentence. Merle d'Aubigné and many others suppose an impossible condition of human nature, when they fight against the outward symbolical expression of the inward thought. The ugly meeting-house, with its bare whitewashed walls and its painted pews, is as much expressive of *one* condition of mind as a cathedral is of *another*. We think the doctor would find it difficult in attacking the latter to find a justification for the former.

Dr. Merle d'Aubigné fathers, and sympathizes, with the sentiment of the Abbé Dr. Luke, who, speaking of the lack of general and religious education in England, says:—"Oh what a shadow in the bright picture of English life! An ecclesiastical institution, stiff, liturgical, technical, and episcopal if you will, but without a well-informed people—without a living flock! Where, I ask, where can this lead to?" The real value of this sentiment is its relative truth. Is it a fact that the people of England have less of religious information and spiritual vitality than the people of other countries? It is not a fact. Let the Abbé, let Merle d'Aubigné, point to any people who have so much. Our author is ever at variance with himself: it is an important part of his creed that true religion can only be the portion of the few, and must be the sole result of the Spirit's teaching and power. Yet here he wonders, in adopting the sentiment of Dr. Luke, that it is not the possession of the many, and attributes the cause to the want of education! We grieve over our past neglect of the poorer classes in this respect: the neglect, however, is not only acknowledged, but is in process of amendment. Education, secular and religious, is now generally within the reach at least, of all. There are, however, such things as godless education and over education. Merle d'Aubigné will do well to remember that the one has led on the continent to Rationalism, and the other, in too many instances in Scotland, to Infidelity.

What does our author mean by the following sentences:—"Theological science plays too prominent a part in Germany: in England it is not held in sufficient importance." This we understand; but how is it to be reconciled with what follows? "If in Germany there is a science and no Church, may it not be said that in England there is a Church and no science? The great aim of the Church is not science but the salvation of souls, and hence the glory of God!"—*ergo*, since we have a Church and no science, we are, according to the doctor, the better fitted to the promotion of the object for which the Church is constituted, and for which science is not necessary. Yet a little lower down this science is recommended to the Church. We cannot understand this: there is, at any rate, confusion in the reasoning; but it is a fair specimen of the author's reasoning style.

For the rest of Merle d'Aubigné's remarks on England and the English Church, we must refer our readers to the work itself. There are many who will, doubtless, be much interested in his descriptions of our popular speakers and readers, whom they will readily recognize under the transparent disguises of

"Mr. M.," "Dr. C.," "Rev. H. S.," "H. Mc. N.," "B. N.," &c.; all of which disguises, assumed in deference to the modesty of the gentlemen in question, we beg to assure our author are very unnecessary; for they are not sufficient for the purposes of concealment, and the persons to whom they refer are by this time, we should hope, beyond the danger of that vanity which an unaccustomed commendation might foster. We have, like the ancients, our idolatries, and we are, unhappily, all worshippers—we only differ in the forms of the gods which we set up. Some of Merle d'Aubigné's encomiums forcibly and painfully remind us of the fact.

When we first opened this work it was with anxiety to read what the author would say on Germany. It was the part of the volume most likely to interest the English reader and we turned to it with eagerness: we were disappointed: it is the smallest portion of the work. A history of his own conversion—just three pages given to the state and progress of German rationalism and philosophy—some common places on the condition and prospects of evangelical religion—an account of his interview with the King of Prussia, and a few hasty remarks on the probable tendencyof the Breslau and Schneidemühle movements, constitute the whole of the author's "Recollections of Germany:" so that, precisely on the subject which was likely to prove most attractive to us in England, Merle d'Aubigné has said the least.

We have remarked that this work is a feeble work; and so, on the whole, in relation to the author's fame and the matters of which he treats, we still think it to be. Nevertheless, there is much that is very interesting as expressive of the light in which a foreigner views us, and many of his remarks on our national defects are undoubtedly true. What this work needs is compression and abstraction. Abstract from it all that is hastily and crudely written—condense the tautological reasoning—withdraw the matter which we already possess in many a better form, and the work, reduced to half its present size, would have much a greater claim on our attention and respect. If it be objected that it was written, not for the doctor's English but for his Genevan friends, we think the remarks which we have hazarded will derive a greater force from the fact; for, as a work of information to those who are unacquainted with us, our objective criticism rests on the stronger ground that the probable mischief of its inaccuracy is the greater; whilst we can see no other reason but that of bookselling for presenting the English public with a translation of so much that is to them superfluous.

Mirabeau: a Life History, in Four Books. Two vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

THE object of these volumes is to place Mirabeau in a light in which history has not hitherto presented him; and, if this had been attempted in a lax and latitudinarian spirit—if the author had shown himself to be one, the standard of whose morality is adapted rather to the passions than the aspirations of an immortal being—we should not hesitate at once to condemn the man and the book. And though we cannot but regret that the talent and genius which the most rigid critic cannot deny to the author should have been devoted to so futile an object, we cannot withhold our admiration from the chivalry which has dictated the crusade against an old, and, as we conceive, justly-founded prejudice of all right-thinking minds. But let him speak for himself as regards his motives to the undertaking:—

"I was induced to undertake this biography by many reasons: first, we have no life whatever of Mirabeau; second, the French have no readable memoirs of him; third, in all our sketches, &c., whatever of him (and they are as numerous as lives are scarce), not only are very many malignant and scandalous false statements fastened upon him, but the actual actions of his life are mis-stated, misdated, or omitted; lastly, I considered him as an ill-used and misjudged man; taking, amid the wrath of parties, the wise moderate course which lay between them: hating mob rule and anarchy as fervently as despotism and absolute monarchical rule, he has fallen in for the plentiful abuse of both parties, which I deemed it quite time, the secret of correct judgment not lying in extremes or excesses, to endeavour to wipe away."

We do not doubt for a moment the sincerity of the author: nay, we will do him the justice to say that he has entered upon his task in the spirit not only of the moralist but the Christian; but even, if he has attained all that he contemplates in the publication of these volumes, to what, on his own showing, does it amount? We will quote his own words:—

"Though no panegyrist, I am, nevertheless, an ardent admirer of Mirabeau: considering him a man *not hateable*—a man, in fact, who demands sympathy and pity—his faults being the result of an improperly-trained and scandalously-neglected childhood. His errors were but half his—his brilliancies, his goodnesses, were his own, entirely and alone."

Now, this is not even-handed justice. If his vices are attributable to his education, his virtues may reasonably be ascribed to the same source.

After all, the *theory* on which the author would claim our ad-

miration of Mirabeau is destroyed by *facts* which cannot be erased from the records of history; and though we fully understand and appreciate the charity which would extenuate where it cannot justify—a charity which has its origin in the only pure source of it, *religion*—all that the writer of these volumes has proved or can have hoped to prove is, that Mirabeau was not so *hateable* as the world has deemed him. "None are all evil" is a maxim on which experience has set the seal of truth; and this is the amount of what the author has proved in the instance of Mirabeau.

But, having said what we have felt it to be our duty (and a painful one it is) to say of the volumes before us, we turn gladly to the more grateful duty of rendering our homage to the touching eloquence, the glowing thought, the poetic, and, withal, Christian feeling which breathe in every page. It is the outpouring of a generous, ardent, but, albeit, mistaken mind. It may, perhaps, startle some of our readers that we should couple the idea of Christianity with the apologist of Mirabeau; but let any man read the passage we are about to quote and tell us if it be the language of infidelity—nay, if it breathe not the spirit of that blessed Book which teaches us that the present, whether measured by its sorrows or its joys, its pleasures or privations, is as nothing in comparison with the glory that shall hereafter be revealed to us :—

"Morning and evening, over town and hamlet, beams forth the touching music of the bells: the bells that rang our forefathers' wedding peals; and funeral dirges chime there still, if not to summon us to the house they sound from, at least to tell us there is a God above us. Cold is the heart that melts not at their music—dull is the spirit that draws no lesson from their chimes. What say they, as methinks I hear them, sweet pealing from the old grey tower, around whose base the mouldering dead lie sleeping? 'Sons of man (runs the melody)! toil on, toil on! even so, by an inscrutable decree, is your destination here: they tell you you should not toil—they tell you you should all battle and fight for what you have not—for what God has seen fit you should not have; and they prate for ever of your *rights!* Heed them not—they are false prophets; and your rights are baseless chimeras not to be battled for, since this earth is not a place of right, of equality, of justice, but simply a place of sojournment, of probation, where no man has his deserts entirely, nor ever shall. It is a place of trial, and whoso endures that trial, be it of poverty or be it of wealth (and both *are* trials), the most uncomplainingly, the most patiently, the most valiantly, that man is the saint of saints. In this advanced century have we yet need to tell, as with a tongue of iron, that earth is but earth, that the heaven is hereafter? The one unvariable law still remains, and must remain until the end of time: it is that earth is no luxury-couch, but a fearful battle-field. Fight on, then, O, ye heaven-conscripts, fight

on: the present is confusion, and wounds, and toiling amid sorrow, and sweat and blood—the glory, the reward, the eternal diadem—those are the great TO-COME!"

We dismiss these volumes with the expression of our deep regret that the talents, eloquence, and genius of the writer had not found a more fitting field for their display.

The Gap of Barnesmore. A Tale of the Irish Highlands and the Revolution of 1688. Three Vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

WE have never, since the days of Sir Walter Scott, taken up an historical romance without being painfully reminded of the immeasurable distance between him and every subsequent and even antecedent writer in the same line. We take up his "Quentin Durward," his "Ivanhoe," his "Old Mortality," again and again, feeling the pleasure we originally enjoyed in his works almost renewed—certainly very little diminished by repetition. He stands beyond and above all others who have ventured on the same path; and it was in anticipation of disappointment, as great as that which we generally experience in taking up a modern romance, that we opened the the "Gap of Barnesmore." Falling short, as it assuredly does of even the least striking of the stories of Sir Walter, it is almost as much superior to the common run of modern fiction as it is inferior to his. The scene is laid in the Irish Highlands, at the period of the Revolution of 1688, opening at the latter end of the reign of James II., and closing in that of William III., when party feeling ran high in religion and politics; so that a writer, young and enthusiastic, as we imagine the author to be, would be very likely to adopt strongly the opinions of one or the other of the parties into whose contests he has flung himself. But unlike many whom we could quote, he holds himself remarkably free from the bias of party, religious or political, giving credit to motives where often he condemns measures. While the historical features of the period are faithfully preserved, the under-currents of the story are managed with very great ingenuity and skill; and, although we trace in some instances a hand not altogether practised in this description of composition, the characters are drawn with much freedom and power. The scenic portraiture, too, is highly graphic; and he makes the most of the picturesque country in which the action of his story is laid. There is considerable pathos in some of the scenes, and occasionally some touches of humour; but these are few and far between, and the author is not so successful in them as in the descriptive portions of his tale.

And yet there are some nice quaint touches in his sketch of the parish priest. We think his delineations of young female character especially happy. An extract from an introductory chapter will explain the feeling with which the author enters upon his task:—

"It may be a perilous attempt to employ in our history materials so nearly allied with quarrels that are yet unextinguished. Rich as those materials are in all that can give interest or dignity to the scenes to which they lend a colouring, their employment has certainly its disadvantage. An injudicious use of them would unquestionably bring exasperating topics into pages of which the only object should be to convey instruction in its most pleasing form. There are many who would, therefore, proscribe them altogether. It may be enough for the writer of this narrative to say, that they do not know the Irish of any party who believe that they cannot look back upon the history of past feuds, and find satisfaction in the remembrance of the heroism of either side. For himself, he will be satisfied if, in this humble effort to portray a most interesting leaf of the national history, he succeed in showing that, even amid the quarrels and contentions which make the history of Ireland one tale of strife, there may be found scenes on which it is possible for the mind to dwell with enthusiasm. Something will have been done to throw a new colouring on the despised history of the past: perhaps something to mitigate the bitterness of present animosities. With these few words of introduction—which, however, have been not quite so few as we intended—we request the reader to prepare himself for a narrative of the Highlands of Donegal and of the era of the Revolution."

This quotation will, we think, justify the tribute which we have felt bound to pay to the impartial spirit that prevades the narrative. We will now endeavour to justify our estimate of his talent for description by a quotation of one of the graphic passages—our selection being determined by the brief space it will occupy—our limits not allowing of extracts, which, although of higher graphic power, it would be inconvenient to transfer to our pages:—

"The scene that presented itself at this moment was one of wild grandeur and terror: the effect of the thunders of the angry torrent, as it rushed down the deep chasm it had torn for itself through the solid rock, and the roaring of the tempest in the wood, cannot easily be conceived; mingled with this was the noise and crackling of the flames that preyed fiercely upon that portion of the castle which they were consuming. Another store of winter's forage had just been caught by the fire, and this added fire made the thick reeking smoke, broken by the forked pyramids of flame, shoot up above the roof: the storm caught the volumes of blaze, and carried them out from the castle in separate sheets of fire eddying on the breeze: the living flames were actually hurled, severed from every burning thing, over

the heads of our party where they stood, lighting up the chasm of the river with a lurid glare; and even fragments of ignited timber, and masses of burning hay and corn were tossed far beyond them like meteors on the breeze; and sometimes, when the burning embers came thick and fast, they passed over their heads, presenting an appearance which might be said to be that of the flakes of an ignited snow-storm. Behind the burning castle rose the high hills, distinct in the clear moon-light, reflecting back a red and strong light from the fire. And over all in the heavens—alternately blue with their native colour and black or white with the clouds that scudded along—the round full moon seemed to fly with a rapidity equal to that of the clouds that were driven by the storm: the light of the moon was clear and distinct and the white radiance which it threw upon the rest of the building contrasted as strangely with the colour of the burning mass as did the red glare which was reflected on the heavens, immediately over and behind the castle, with the silvery light that softened the rest of the sky. The mingling of these lights on the spot where Hamilton stood, as each was thrown occasionally through cloud and smoke upon the river, the trees, and the group of human figures that were assembled there, produced an effect of colouring which a painter *might* describe on canvass, but an idea of which no words *can* convey."

In conclusion, we may observe that the interest of the story is sustained throughout; the only fault—a rare one in works of this character—being that the incidents are somewhat crowded, so that the reader has scarcely time to breath between one scene of excitement and another. Altogether it is a very creditable production, and reflects great honour on the discrimination of the publishers, who have thus taken up a hitherto unknown author. We hope this will not be his last work.

History of the Jesuits, from the Foundation of their Society to its Suppression: their Mission throughout the World: their Educational System and Literature, with their Revival and Present State. By Andrew Steinmetz. Three Vols. Bentley. London.

This is precisely the book that we Protestants at this very time so especially want—a book written without partiality or prejudice and with the single view of giving a succinct and faithful account of the Jesuits and their doings. No other people have been so much lauded by friends or reviled by enemies: none have been more honoured or more scorned: they have been the objects of the most exaggerated praise and the most unmeasured abuse; but there is not the least necessity to exaggerate anything for or against them, if the object in writing the history of the Society of Jesus is to excite an extraordinary in-

terest about them, since the mere recital of these proceedings would make up a story that should far surpass in extravagance, and in the wildness and oddity of its details, all the works of fiction that were ever penned. For instance, no imagination could conceive a story of more thrilling, or perhaps painful, interest than would the history of Jesuit Robert de Nobili in the Madeira mission. No writer of fiction ever imagined a character like that of the Jesuit Saniassi; nor was anything ever written that could exceed in interest the details of the life of another Jesuit, the Padre Beschi, and especially under his assumed Pagan name of Viramamouni. This man's whole life was a lie, and the every thought and action of his life was to screen himself from the detection which hourly threatened him from the people among whom he lived. He assumed the dress and character of a Brahmin of the purest caste, and as such had four provinces assigned to him for a maintenance, with a yearly revenue of 1,200 rupees, and the office of prime minister to the nabob. He had with him on all occasions an escort of thirty horsemen with twelve standard-bearers, and four attendants with silver staves; while camels with cymbals, and drums, and trumpets, with mass ornaments, and baggage, and tents, accompanied him in all his movements.

Equally curious and equally indicative of the one mind of the Jesuits to be all things, right or wrong, with all men, were the doings of Matteo Ricci and Adam Schall in China. How indomitable was their perseverance—how great and unceasing their labours—how wonderful their attainments—how varied their fortunes—and how fruitless in the end their efforts! No lovers of the marvellous will ever find in tales of fiction such strange incidents recorded, as are recorded in these volumes, of the Jesuit missionaries in heathen lands, most of whom were men of very great intellectual and scientific attainments, of great strength of character, of determined purpose to make good their object; who thought all things possible to their labours; who worked in the conviction that success must inevitably go with their works; and that they must infallibly triumph in the end over all the difficulties and obstructions that were opposed to them.

To the reflecting Christian, indeed, these volumes will present innumerable subjects for his meditations, and many also for his consolation. He will here see the result of the craftiest and subtlest of all human devices and systems that were ever framed to promote the interest of a class at the expense of all honesty and truth—never was the rule of right so glaringly departed from—never was rectitude of principle so utterly disregarded as

it was by the Society of Jesus, whenever either interfered with their views. Equivocation, deception, suppression of facts, perversion of the truth, falsehood open or concealed, were unsparingly used whenever it seemed expedient to them to use them; and never was a system of expediency so fully carried out as by the Jesuits—never was craft and guile by any people so unscrupulously employed—until at length the society became execrated by all the Roman Catholic States of Europe—intolerable even to the Pope himself, who pronounced its doom in these words:—"Inspired by the Divine Spirit, as we trust, urged by the duty of restoring concord to the Church, convinced that the Company of Jesus can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded, we abolish and annul the Company of Jesus, its offices, houses, and institutions." Thus spoke the Pope Clement XIV.; but another Pope, Pius VII., has annulled his predecessor's decree, and restored the Company of Jesus, which again appears as an order in the Roman Church. They have, however, already again earned to themselves the ill-will of every people among whom they were found; and have within the last two years been expelled in consequence from Switzerland, Bavaria, Sardinia, Austria, Naples, and even from Rome; and are now, with their general, Roothaan, congregated together here, in the full hope and most eager desire of making England their prey. Their history tells us that they will leave no means untried to gain their ends; that as De Nobili assumed the Brahmin and Acosta the Pariah, in order to ingraft Christianity on Paganism, so may they assume to be priests in the English Church and professors in our Protestant universities—to engraft Romanism on Protestantism—and secretly to corrupt and destroy the faith which they profess openly to teach and uphold. When our historians—the men most anxious to make them appear in the best light possible—incontestably prove that they are capable of any fraud—would stop at no deceit to accomplish their purpose—that one after the other, during a whole hundred years together, they would persist in using the same deceitful means to secure their objects, no length of time wearied them, no deceitfulness of unrighteousness deterred them.

Mr. Steinmitz, indeed, is of opinion that their day is past for ever. Awhile, he thinks, they may interfere in the concerns of the world; but never more will they either rule or convert kingdoms. They have, however, a most earnest longing to rule more or less despotically over us; and we know that every effort will be made by two or three of the most zealous patronizers of popery and expediency among our present Ministers to

give to the Jesuits the utmost latitude of power, to do all the evil possible indirectly in this kingdom, and directly throughout all its colonies. The determination is, we repeat, to legalize the order of the Society of Jesus in England openly, if the strength of the Russell and Peel party will suffice to carry it: otherwise, what cannot in this way be gained, will secretly be carried by obscure and crafty clauses in Acts of Parliament, where such things would not be looked for; and power then be given them to hold, under the express sanction of a law, all the lands in England which they may be able to clutch by force or by fraud.

With regard to the volumes before us we cannot, indeed, say too much in commendation of them—so full and so faithful is the information they give of the general doings and designs of the craftiest enemies that Protestant England has, of the deadliest foes to the peace, purity, and safety of our Church. Nor are the writer's own reflections upon the extraordinary facts, as they pass under his observation, the least interesting portion of the work: the whole is ably written in very forcible language that allows of no yawning or slumbering over the pages. We might have wished the chapters had been more in number; since comprising, as each of them does, so large an amount of information, and that on objects of such peculiar interest, each chapter contains more than by one reading most memories could retain; and a great help to the work, as a book of reference, would undoubtedly have been a full index of persons and places as well as of subjects. But all who desire to know what Jesuitism has ever been and what it now is—what its power in past times and what its influence and means at present —should consult these volumes: they are of the highest interest, and abound with anecdotes and histories and characters of men very eminent in their day, who exercised an almost unlimited influence in several of the kingdoms of this world, and who will live to fame so long as history carries down the stream of time the names of those who made themselves memorable in their day for their virtues or their crimes, as a blessing or a curse to their several generations.

It is very evident the publisher has spared no expence to make these volumes worthy of their subject, and worthy also of a place in any library in the land. The letter-press, the portraits, and engravings, are all that the most fastidious could desire; and we welcome the work as one of the most elegant, and amusing, and instructive, that the press of late years has brought under our observation.

Ireland before and after the Union with Great Britain. By R. M. MARTIN, Esq., Author of the "History of the British Colonies," &c. Third Edition with Additions. London: L. B. Nichols and Son. 1848.

THIS work has been frequently and favourably noticed. That it is generally appreciated is manifested from the fact that it has reached a third edition. This edition appeared at a time when, according to one of the magniloquent addresses issued from the Dublin Corn Exchange, England stood charged with tyranny, injustice, and cruelty, towards Ireland, and when the Irish were about to commit themselves to a formidable resistance; and, in this address, it is asserted that "England has inflicted more grievous calamities upon Ireland than any country on the face of the earth besides has done upon any other. In the history of mankind there is nothing to be compared with the atrocity of the crimes which England has perpetrated on the Irish people." Again: "The voice of the civilised world lays to the charge of the English Government the guilt of having produced this exasperation of national feeling—this misery, this wretchedness, this exhaustion, this destitution." So says this veracious document. The object of those who penned this and similar productions has been made manifest by subsequent events: it was to drive the poorer classes of their countrymen into open rebellion and to profit by the outbreak. The promised rebellion has at length come off, and has turned out a mere station-house affair: it has been seized by the collar by a few policemen, and ignominiously marched off to the lock-up amidst the derisive shouts of those who were solemnly called upon to witness the issue. The civilised world will know better henceforth how to estimate Irish wrongs and Irish patriotism. The conclusion of this long threatened assault upon the Saxon, to which every sympathising ruffian in revolutionised Europe looked forward with such glee, is worthy of the men who commenced it—it is contemptible. Every body can now measure, from an experience common to all, the exact value of the sayings and doings of Irish agitators. From the solemn promise of Mr. John O'Connell, to "die on the floor of the House of Commons," down to the warlike position taken up by Smith O'Brien amongst the cabbages of widow M'Cormack's garden, it has been one big bounce—a lie, and that of no small dimensions—in constant action and expressed in every variety of form in which it was possible to manifest its unblushing nature. The best excuse that is now made for the great promoter of the outbreak, the "not *yet*" "King of Munster," is, that he is mad; but, if he be mad, his madness

has that "method in it" which brings it legitimately within the cognizance of the law; and we, therefore, trust that, whatever may be the ultimate decision of those with whom his judgment will rest, it will not be forgotten that life has been lost—that the animosity of an unforgiving race has been urged into frenzy—and that a large country has been thrown back at least twenty years in civilization and resource to gratify the insane vanity of some and the selfish wickedness of others. If the so-called patriotism of the Irish leaders had been backed by one particle of common sense, common honesty, or common courage, universally shared amongst them, the result might have been very different. As it is, the Irish have ungratefully smitten the hand that fed four millions of them day by day; and the same voice that must shortly plead for food has been loud in contemptuous execration of those by the sweat of whose brow bread to feed them must be procured. Last year the Irish cost us upwards of ten millions: it is more than probable that, in the coming winter, they will have again to appeal to English benevolence. They have spent the year in the mischievous and idle occupation of terrorism; and the natural consequence, added to the judicial visitation of Providence, will most likely be starvation and destitution. By way of thanksgiving for the past, and as a claim upon us for the future, we have witnessed Mr. Mitchell's ingenious and demoniacal theories of missile warfare, in the shape of broken bottles and vitriol-throwing, universally approved. Nothing but courage and opportunity have been wanting to give these theories a practical application. If the Irish will not work they are not ashamed to beg, and the cry for future help will be as abject as the indifference to past relief has been insolent. There was not a house in England that did not bear its share of the common burthen, either in the necessity for increased exertion on the part of those who worked, or in the amount of privation required to meet the exigency on the part of those possessing a bare competency. Yet in every house the burden was cheerfully borne. The Saxon was abused and vilified as a tyrant and persecutor, possessing a hand of iron and a heart of stone, and this at the very moment he was only busied in devising the means of relieving the Celt. The Saxon saw nothing but the misery of his brother; and, taking no heed to the abuse that was heaped on him, worked on the harder that he might, in addition to the wants of his own household, provide for the necessities of others. He did not complain—he did not ask the question how far this destitution was the result of a dishonest improvidence. But in towns and in villages—from

house to house—in churches and chapels—appeals were made and answered. The widow's mite went along with the prince's donation to alleviate the misery of those who count the relief of their suffering to be a paramount duty devolving upon England and reckon the enquiry as to its causes a national insult. But will it be so in future? Will there be no remembrance of past ingratitude? Will there be no manifestation of honest indignation at the constantly-recurring cry for help on the part of those who will not help themselves? We fancy that such a forbearance is more than can be expected from human nature. "Justice for England" is a cry that, in its turn, must be heard and attended to.

Mr. Martin answers the charge against England of oppression by a reference to facts, of which he gives a summary in the preface to the third edition. We have not space for all of them, but we will quote one or two. Mr. Martin says, "The liberty or rather license of language granted to the newspaper press in Ireland has never been permitted to the British press, or accorded to the newspapers of Europe or America by their respective governments." This cannot be denied.

"The poor of Ireland are indebted to an English Parliament for a legislative provision for their support." This measure was strenuously opposed by Mr. O'Connell and his tail.

"Ireland is one of the least taxed portions of the British Empire. Out of 52,000,000*l.* levied in the United Kingdom, scarcely 4,500,000*l.* is raised in Ireland, from a population equal to half the population of England. The total net revenue of Ireland, in 1846, was only 4,333,933*l.*—a sum barely more than sufficient to provide the interest of the portion of the national debt assigned to Ireland. Taking the annual revenue, in round numbers, of Ireland at present, as 4,600,000*l.*, the expenditure as 8,600,000*l.*, and the interest on debt at 4,200,000*l.*, the deficiency is 8,200,000*l.* Ireland, therefore, costs the British exchequer at least this sum. Estimating the annual deficiency of Ireland at three millions sterling, the cost of Ireland to England, since the Union, amounts to 141,000,000*l.* This fact deserves consideration in both countries.

"There are no assessed taxes whatever in Ireland—no land tax on lands and tenements—no stamp duties on stage carriages and railways—no tax on soap, bricks, hops, post-horse duties; and no window-tax or taxes on servants, horses, carriages, &c.—no property or income-tax. The produce of these and other taxes from which Ireland is exempt was, in 1846, nearly 13,000,000*l.*

"Then the stamp duties, licenses, &c., are, in many instances, lower in Ireland than in England or in Scotland. The favour which Ireland has received from the Imperial Legislature may be illustrated by the article of spirits, which pays per gallon, in England, 7s. 10d.; in Scotland, 3s. 8d.: and, in Ireland, 2s. 8d.

"In her local taxation, Ireland presents exemptions. Thus, England is taxed locally 12,000,000*l.*, or 15s. per head; Scotland, 1,000,000*l*, or 8s. per head; Ireland 2,000,000*l.*—only 5s. per head!

Such are some of the facts with which Mr. Martin meets the charge of injustice towards Ireland on the part of England. We are quite aware, however, that statistical facts, whilst they prove a particular point, may be no answer to a general charge: for a nation highly favoured in the lightness of the monetary burden laid upon her may still be treated with great injustice in the repression of her energies, the partial distribution of power and patronage, and the intolerance of her national faith. But the energies of Ireland are not industrial; the paths which lead to fame and distinction are open to her children; and the English Government has of late certainly manifested no indisposition to give perfect facility for the complete development of all the religious sympathies of the Irish. Ireland has only honestly to say what will satisfy her as regards her religion; and, whatever *we* may think of the matter, the Legislature is quite ready to grant it. That there has unhappily been misgovernment every body must admit; but this has arisen not so much from the desire of the English to oppress as from the impracticability of the Irish themselves. Who can govern them?—what will satisfy them? Coercion begets rebellion—concession fosters insult—indulgence secures idleness and terrorism—the priesthood deal dishonestly and craftily—the landlords are reckless and improvident—agitators on every hand live and fatten on the elements of strife and discord which they continually nourish as necessary to their existence, and the peasantry murder for hire. What is to be done with such a people? English capital has been often introduced to institute a manufacture and beget a commerce; but the owners of it have been as often intimidated with the threat of assassination and driven from the country. Whoever attempts a reform or advocates industry is shot without mercy. Government after government in England is overthrown by the failure of some new political *nostrum* applied to the incurable disease of Ireland's social misery. With a batch of Irish members in the house, whose only employment is to complain of grievance and frustrate every honest effort made to alleviate it, the Legislature exhausts its wisdom in devising fresh expedients to meet the evil, and its patience in witnessing the deliberate efforts made to render them futile. If *repeal* were all that the Irish desired, it would be better for ourselves to give it at once. It is not repeal, however, but separation, that they seek; and this in self-defence

we cannot grant; for, sooner or later, Ireland would fall into the hands of France, and we should have to conquer it over again or be ourselves invaded from its shores. The Irish cannot govern themselves—they never could. Give them all they clamour for at the present moment, and they would institute a faction fight from one end of the land to the other. Class against class, clan against clan, they would contend till no strength was left, and the very misery of their condition would both require and invite a conquest.

We cannot help, in connection with this subject, offering a remark upon that which we should think must be obvious to all—the very dastardly and dishonest course pursued by the Roman Catholic priests. With a few noble exceptions, they urged and incited the people to an outbreak: exactly at the period when failure was evident, they were just as urgent in exhorting the people to peace: they then come before a Government whose liberality amounts to a folly, and claim as a reward of their laudable efforts the approbation of the Crown. Some of these priests were as furious in their denunciations of English injustice, and as energetic in their appeals to Irish passion, as the laymen who are now awaiting in prison their judgment for broken laws: others of the priests, who did not openly commit themselves, gave a tacit consent by their silence to the deeds of their bolder brethren. Yet, at the very time when their condemnation of rebellion has neither place nor value, they come forward with an empty protest, deplore with hypocritical sorrow the errors of their unhappy countrymen, and demand general pardon as the reward of their own self-denying efforts to preserve the peace. Out upon them!—out upon such base dishonesty and crafty cunning! They may gull Lord John and his compeers, who, on the subject of Romanism, have a remarkable capacity for being be-fooled; but they will neither deceive the English nation nor their own flocks. They have already lost the respect and affection of the poor creatures whom they first excited and then betrayed. We suppose, however, that they will care little for this, since they know what is the exact measure of the relation between M'Hale craft and Whig simplicity, and are perfectly aware by this time of the benevolent intentions of the Government. An endowment will place them at once beyond the necessity of consulting the wishes of their people; and also, if we mistake not, aid them in ultimately accomplishing the ambitious objects which they have in view.

But we are forgetting ourselves: the public are wearied with the Irish question: it has been submitted to a kaleidescope process; and its several details have been presented in every

possible variety of combination of which they are capable. We can say nothing new or striking on a subject so completely exhausted. For matter, the work before us contains more than we could possibly adduce within the limits which we possess; and, in reasoning, it anticipates all we might suggest and confirms all that we have ever thought. It is a valuable work, enhanced in its claims upon our notice by the peculiarity of the time and circumstances in which the third and amended edition makes its appearance.

Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum, Philone et Josepho, Patribus Apostolicis, aliisque Ecclesiæ Antiquæ Scriptoribus, necnon Libris Apocryphis, maxime deprompta, instruxit atque ornavit Novi Testamenti Hellenistice illustrati recens. Editor, THOMAS GRINFIELD, M.A. Londini: Pickering, 1848. Two Parts or Vols., 8vo.

IN the thirteenth volume of our journal (p. 489), we introduced to our readers the Rev. Thomas Grinfield's truly valuable Hellenistic edition of the New Testament. The present work, of which the possessors of that edition will do well to avail themselves, is an independent publication, which is calculated to throw much light on the phraseology of the New Testament, by apposite quotations from the Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, from the apostolic fathers, and other writers of the ancient Church, as well as from the apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments. A copious table of parallel passages, cited from the Old Testament in the New, appropriately terminates this laborious undertaking, which reflects the highest honour on the industry and research of its learned and reverend author, who has devoted more than twenty years to the study and preparation of this most valuable contribution to the critical study of the New Testament.

Loyalty and Religion the Safeguard of the Nation. By the Rev. B. BANNING, M.A., Vicar of Wellington, Salop. London: Painter, 1848.

THIS is a sermon preached, as we are told on the title, before the members of a Friendly Society, and is especially appropriate to the times in which we live; when, although as has been sufficiently proved, loyalty is the predominant feeling of the nation, there are many bad principles and bad men at work in the humbler ranks of society. It is a clear and scriptural exposition of the command to "fear God and honour the king;" and it is written with the simplicity which is the language of all honest men.

Poems. By J. H. Röhrs, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. London: Madden. 1848.

In these utilitarian days, when everything, from the cooking of a potato to the propulsion of a railway train, is performed by steam, and when verses, as far as our latter experience is concerned, are the result of the same process, a volume which "breaks not to the hope" the promise held out in the title-page is a boon as welcome as it is unexpected. The tissue of the volume before us is not of uniform fineness; nor do we sympathise with the feelings which have dictated some of the lyrics, though all breathe the spirit of poetry; and especially we object to the sentiment of those in which the author vents his wrath against capital punishments. No man rejoices more than do we that our criminal code has been modified to the limiting of the extreme penalty of the law to one or two enormities of crime. At the same time, we cannot evade the fact that the present age has produced a Thurtell, a Burke, and a Courvoisier; and that there is no barrier between the knives of such members of the community and our throats half so effectual as the "gallows;" and, though our author pathetically laments the expenditure of time and timber on its construction, we still think it a useful although not very ornamental variety of *architecture*—(we are warranted in the use of the word by the author's prefixture of "The Architects of the Gallows" to one of his lyrics). Nevertheless, Jesus College has reason to be proud of her son; for, although the volume before us is marred by blemishes which a little care might have obviated, a broad and deep vein of the true gold of poetry runs throughout. He is singularly happy in his epithets, and his verses are remarkably smooth and harmonious. The following extract from a poem entitled "Musings on a November Day and Night" will, we hope, justify our eulogy:—

"'Tis a drear cold time, half rain, half snow,
That falls, but whitens not fields below.
The rain-drops patter from leaf to leaf,
Sobbing like one in hopeless grief.
Low-trailing clouds creep over-head,
Shapeless in one grey ocean spread:
Ever the same, they come and go
In a ceaseless wearying flow;
And, blending with the lower clouds,
A rhymy mist the distance shrouds;
And in the far pine-woods, all between
The reeking earth and the sullen green
Of their dark crusts, a dim white screen
That vapour hangs—to hide the night

That lurks there in the broad day-light.
The lark on her winter's couch is still,
But the raven croaks from the rain-dark hill,
And the owl o'er the last dug grave screams shrill:
There has she flitted since fall of night,
Like a restless soul, in her plumage white,
Wearily waiting the dawn of day:
For she deems 'tis the moon, with prisoned ray,
Shines through those heavens dull and grey.
The noon has no light, and the air no breeze,
To shake the drops from the laden trees:
The loftiest elm's last crowning bough
Has never a twig that trembles now.
And the yew trees that gird the old church tower,
And shelter the dead from sun and shower,
Shadowing stand, without motion and breath,
Mute as the clay that sleeps coffined beneath.
The gloom and the chill without creep in
Through every sense to the soul within."

There are pieces of a more lively character in the volume, in which pathos and playfulness, feeling and fancy, are happily blent.

A Familiar Explanation of the Higher Parts of Arithmetic. By the Rev. FREDERICK CALDER, B.A., Head Master of the Grammar School, Chesterfield. London: Whittaker. 1848.

THE author's object, as explained in the preface, is to supply a want, which he has experienced as a teacher, of a schoolbook, to explain the more difficult parts of arithmetic in a manner sufficiently familiar for the comprehension of youth. We consider that the author has succeeded in supplying a desideratum —namely, in establishing a bridge between ordinary and algebraic arithmetic.

The One Hope of All Believers, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures: a Word for Warning and Strengthening in an Evil Day. From the German. By C. P. P. London: Painter, 1848.

THE object of these pages is to place in a prominent point of view the doctrine of our Lord's second coming upon *earth;* which the author maintains is too frequently disregarded or undervalued by many professing Christians. The subject is treated, as we conceive, in a sound and scriptural manner; and we are glad to see this little tract published at a price which will enhance its usefulness by facilitating its circulation among those to whom a more expressive publication would be inaccessible.

The Closing Scene; or Christianity and Infidelity Contrasted in the Last Hours of Remarkable Persons. By the Author of "The Bishop's Daughter," "Self Sacrifice," the "Life Book of a Labourer," &c., &c. London: Longman and Co., 1848.

THAT the tree shall be known by its fruit is a golden rule of the Gospel, as applicable to the philosophies of unbelief as to the creeds of faith. There are no such things as negative positions in human life as many seem to suppose: a man must be under some positive influence—either that of faith, of principle, of impulse, of passion, or of appetite—and a positive influence must lead to positive results. This is a condition of our being; so that what we believe ourselves and instil into others becomes more than a matter of indifferent or curious speculation. It inevitably affects our own conduct in our intercourse with our fellows, and furnishes rules to those who receive our teaching which must produce their legitimate consequences. With respect to what is designated "scepticism," there are very few men who can be properly called sceptics: that many profess themselves to be such is another matter. Faith is not the result of an intellectual process, but an instinct—an instinct of the spirit when its objects are spiritual—an instinct of our nature when it is manifested in those forms of relative trust and confidence necessary to the social existence of human life. Faith, in the highest order of truth, is the consent of the heart rather than the assent of the understanding; and it is very difficult, if indeed it be at all possible, to find a man, in whom the instincts of faith are so deadened as to have no exercise at all, or who has contrived to make the reasoning powers fill up every place and function which faith is properly called to occupy in the constitution of our being. There are a thousand things surrounding us—there is many a hidden motion of the heart and spirit of which every man is conscious—that instinctively testify to the existence of invisible and immaterial beings, causes, and influences; and no one can at all times resist the influence of evidences so powerful as these. One merit of the work before us is the proof that occurs in every page of the truth which we are propounding. These pages clearly show, on the one hand, that what *is called* "scepticism" is a positive principle of action producing positive results; and, on the other, that what is commonly understood as scepticism, by those who profess it, is an impossible condition. The positive denial of divine truths leads men to the positive disregard of social obligations; and the profession of perfect unbelief is always in times of difficulty and danger stultified by some involuntary ejaculation, which betrays that, after all, the instincts

of the spirit are stronger than the deceptive sophistries of the intellect. The loose social maxims of Hume—the immoral practical results of the theories of Rousseau—show the one: the fearful visions of Shelly, the cry for help to Jesus in the dying agony of Paine, the "*Mon Dieu*," "*Mon Dieu*," of Volney in the prospect of shipwreck, manifest the other.

One fact is worth whole *tomes* of fiction, for the evidence of a fact is one which all can receive: it is within the comprehension of the most unlettered: it carries conviction with it where the conclusions of reasoning fail, either for want of force in themselves or want of understanding in those to whom they are addressed. What a man thinks will always have an influence; but what a man does will always have a greater. It is when men are in circumstances of difficulty or danger that the true value of the principles which they profess becomes manifest. They who stand by are then able to watch their exercise, and measure the sincerity of a professed faith or of an acknowledged unbelief by their results.

Of all the scenes in which we are enabled to separate the true from the false—to recognise the one and detect the other —"the closing scene" is the most solemn and effectual. The hand of death has a power in it which strips away every disguise in which the spirit of man has wrapt himself: when the fell monarch is near, secrets are discovered that have been hidden for a life. The dying man and those who stand around to witness his departure then learn what, under any other circumstances, they never could have known. Men who set at nought the common faith of their fellows, as common prejudices, build up and sustain for themselves a philosophic reputation by force of hardy assertion or subtle reasoning, but neither the one nor the other will avail in the solemn realities of death: to meet these, hardihood has no true strength—to avoid these, subtlety has no power of evasion. It matters not by what name a Christian may be called in the vocabulary of philosophic scepticism—it matters not by what terms the manifestations of his faith may have been designated—his dying hour proves that he "knows in whom he has believed." The fact of his peaceful and hopeful departure sets a seal to the great truths upon which he has based the rule of his life which no false reasoning can ever remove. He lived in the faith of the Gospel; and "the closing scene" proves that he "followed no cunningly-devised fable." His whole life has been one fact in the course of conduct which he has pursued: his death presents another, in the manner of his departure. The two great facts together are insurmountable evidence to the truth and reality of the

great objects of the Christian's faith, as well as to the living power of that faith itself.

It is in these points of view that a work like this before us is so valuable: it is a relation of facts—the facts of life and of death. We have in it the biographies of celebrated individuals, each of whom is a type in himself of a particular class—an example either of the force of Christian faith or the results of unbelief. The author has selected his characters from every walk of life; and his special object has been to show what are the opposite effects of Christianity and scepticism upon their several possessors, and to test the value of the principles professed by a record of the scene which has closed their mortal career. The idea has been suggested by a knowledge of that which, after all, possesses the greatest hold upon the human mind. The power which there is in the evidence of facts and the method of expressing the idea is both ably and simply carried out. Many more such facts might doubtless be gathered together; but much judgment has been displayed in the selection. Some of these biographical sketches—as, for instance, that of the life of Sarah Martin—will be new to the generality of readers; whilst all of them are put together in a manner and written in a style that render them no mean additions to the instructive literature of the day. The author deserves the thanks of his Christian friends for his labour of love; and the appreciation of the reading public will, we trust, afford him a convincing proof that love's labour has not been lost in collecting together records which are at once interesting and edifying.

The Young Westminster. No. 1. London: Ginger. 1848.

We give our cordial welcome to the first number of a monthly periodical from Westminster School, with which ancient and noble institution we have many sympathies. We trust that there is a spirit among the *old* Westminsters which will not allow this effort of the *young* Westminsters to perish for want of patronage, for the boys themselves cannot be supposed to sustain it from their own funds. If they supply the *talent* it is as much as we can expect. The quality of the present number affords bright promise for the future; and, commending it to the notice of the public generally, we especially claim for it the support of those who are friendly to establishments similar to that from which it emanates. Among other attractions, it contains a sweetly-touching poem, entitled "My Father's Name."

A Summary Practical Elucidation of National Economy in Support of Direct Taxation and Direct Assessment. By Robert Watt. Edinburgh: R. Marshall.

We lose no time in noticing the above work, which contains a mass of practical information on many of those important subjects which are now urging themselves upon the consideration of all thinking men. Mr. Watt is a commercial agent in Edinburgh, and deserves well of the public for the industry he has shown in collecting the information contained in this volume, for the ability he has manifested in forming his judgment, and for the manly and independent spirit he has discovered in fearlessly stating his opinions. We do not pretend to agree with Mr. Watt in all the remedies which he has suggested as a cure for the evils which afflict our agricultural, financial, and commercial interests, and on the subject of direct taxation we are quite at issue with him; but we will do him the justice to say that his views, generally, are founded on sound principles. The production is, as we have said, a practical work, containing the views and sentiments of a man living, and thinking, and writing, in the midst of the transactions which he has undertaken to discuss. The book is necessarily diffuse and without order or arrangement, being a compilation of various communications addressed to the editor of a public journal at different periods from the year 1836, since which time the agriculture of the country has made rapid advancement. We consider the volume a storehouse of moral and statistical facts, highly important at the present juncture and well deserving the serious attention of the philosopher, the statesman, and the legitimate trader.

The Speeches of the Right Hon. the Earl of Chatham: with a Biographical Memoir. New Edition. London: Aylott and Jones, 1848.

We are glad to see a reprint, in a form rendered acceptable to the generality of readers by its extreme cheapness, of the speech of this great statesman and orator. At a period when Parliamentary eloquence is at so very low an ebb, we are glad to turn from the dearth of the present to the wealth of the past. The memoir prefixed is not the least valuable part of the publication, which, we are informed, is only a portion of a series of re-publications of the speeches of English orators, including Erskine, Sheridan, and Burke. The work is very neatly got up, in a handsome library size.

An Authentic Interpretation of the Guarantee of England and France, with reference to the Duchy of Schleswig. Compiled from Documentary Sources. By Dr. WILLIAM LEVERKUS, Keeper of the Records of the Grand Duchy of Oldenburg. Translated and Edited, with Prefatory Remarks, by EWING PYE COLQUHOUN, Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, late of the University of Heidelberg. London: 1848.

THIS well-timed publication comes upon us at a period when the whole continent of Europe is mad with *theories*, and when *facts* are especially valuable. We had given our German neighbours considerable credit for sober thinking: indeed, we had paid them the compliment of believing that much of the solidity of the English character was attributable to our Saxon origin. But the Frankfort Parliament puzzles our philosophy altogether: we only hope that the wild notion of constructing *unity* out of materials which have not in them the quality of cohesion, may not plunge Europe into a war, which it is the obvious interest of all parties to avoid at any sacrifice but that of honesty.

We cannot, by any attempt at epitomizing the work before us, more completely possess our readers with its scope and object than by the following extract from Mr. Colquhoun's preface:—

"The object in the following pages is to prove—

"That either the Danish *lex regia* should be received in the Duchy of Schleswig in its entirety or not at all; at any rate, not that particular provision of it alone which substitutes the female for the male succession:

"That neither did the patent of homage of 22nd of August, 1721, incorporate the ducal with the royal part of Schleswig, much less both with Denmark Proper, by the words *secundum tenorem legis regiæ:*

"That the oath of fealty was sworn to Christian I. as Duke of Schleswig, not as King of Denmark:

"That until the patent of the 8th of July, 1846, was published, the Danish court had never ventured to assert the incorporation, pretended to have taken place in 1460, as a legal reality.

"With respect to the guarantees of England and France—

"That those powers only guaranteed in any case the ducal part—viz., that part which was wrested in 1720 from the Gottorf family:

"That the word *Ducal* has been omitted in some reprints:

"That the guarantee which was in 1721 interpreted in the case of the Bishop of Lübeck *versus* the Crown of Denmark by Great Britain only applied to the portion formerly belonging to the house of Holstein-Gottorf:

"That the rights of private or third persons were not intended to be affected thereby:

"That no rights were guaranteed but those which the former possessor of that part of the country had enjoyed; and, lastly—

"That the Danish family did not wish to supersede the inheritance in the male, and transfer it to the female line."

The public are much indebted to Mr. Ewing Colquhoun for this little but important pamphlet, which, if not absolutely essential to the right understanding of this "vexed," and extremely *vexing*, question, will prove a valuable acquisition to the information of all who are interested in the subject.

Arithmetic for Young Children. By H. GRANT. New Edition. London: Grant and Griffith. 1848.

ADMIRABLY adapted to the object it proposes to accomplish—namely, to teach the infant mind the rudiments of arithmetic. The plan is happily conceived; and we have tested its efficiency.

Testimony to the Truth: or the Autobiography of an Atheist. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1848.

THIS has internal and unmistakeable evidence of being a genuine narrative; and, as such, possesses a value compared with which a work of fiction subsides into insignificance. It is written without any pretension to the graces of style or composition, and the single aim is better than the double one. There cannot exist a doubt of the intention or spirit in which the narrative is given to the world. It is a journal of thoughts and feelings, belonging to a life of much vicissitude and some trial; the scene lying principally in one of the Australian colonies. The language is simple, and the story not without interest even to those who read for amusement; and to many who take it up with no other motive it may insensibly convey the lesson it is designed to teach. In a word, it is a chart for the voyager on the troublous sea of life, in which are laid down the rock and the quicksand as well as the secure anchorage and the safe haven.

Questions on Church History: from the Earliest Period to the Present Century. Addressed Particularly to Young Persons. By EMMA M. KING. London: Painter. 1848.

THIS, as the title imports, is a work on the history of the Church in the form of question and answer, and is, therefore, especially adapted for the instruction of the young, in at all times an important, and, at the present juncture, a very interesting branch of study. Although comprised within some hundred and fifty pages, it contains a marvellous amount of valuable information, based on indisputable authority. The great recommendation of the work is the impartiality with which the

author has addressed herself to her task. It is not a one-sided view of the many questions involved in its pages; and may, therefore, safely be committed to the youthful student, on whose plastic mind the earlier impressions are commonly the more enduring. The object of the author is evidently to teach the truth, and there is no leaning to any particular party in the Church. It is, in fact, the sort of work which we would wish to form one of the standard books of our schools, for which the simplicity of the language and soundness of its views peculiarly adapt it. It contains, in a compendious form, the result of extensive reading; and the more advanced student will find in it much to refresh his recollections, if not to add to his information, on the subject to which it refers.

Egypt and Nubia. From Sketches by DAVID ROBERTS, R.A.; the Literature by WILLIAM BROCKENDON.

THE eleventh and twelfth parts of this work are now before us; and, reserving more especial remark for the completion of the series, we may observe that, as the undertaking progresses, it increases in splendour. Nothing can be more beautiful or effective than the illustrations of these numbers, especially the scenic embellishments, which have all the character, finish, and richness of original drawings.

The Voice of Many Waters. A Tale for Young People. By Mrs. DAVID OSBORNE. With Illustrations by A. COOPER, R.A., and A. W. COOPER. London: Wilson. 1848.

THE object of this gracefully got up little volume, as modestly stated by the author in her preface, "is merely to relate a few interesting particulars connected with the various oceans, seas, and rivers which occupy, at least, three-fourths of the surface of the globe." The language is singularly and most appropriately simple and the style attractive, while the information conveyed is various and interesting, and a vein of unaffected piety runs through the whole. Mrs. Osborne displays a vast amount of geographical, and even topographical, knowledge, which especially qualifies her for the task she has proposed to herself, and which she has carried out in a manner that cannot but commend her little volume to the favour, not merely of the younger portion of the community, but to all who are interested in their education and improvement. Although the volume assumes the character of a dialogue between the teacher and the taught, it is not, like many works on a similar plan, broken up into short sentences, to which we greatly object; but the narratives

are continuous for many pages. Not the least attractive feature in the book are the illustrations, which are spirited in design and effectively and delicately engraved. Mrs. Osborne, in the present addition to our juvenile literature, has rendered an acceptable service to society, and we shall be glad to find her continuing a course which she has so successfully begun. We cordially recommend the "Voice of Many Waters."

The Bible of every Land; or, a History, Critical and Philosophical of all the Versions of the Sacred Scriptures, in every Language and Dialect, into which Translations have been made. With Specimen Portions, in their own Characters. Part I. London: Bagster and Sons, 8vo. 1848.

This work fills up a chasm in Biblical literature: while it illustrates the progress of divine truth, in connexion with missionary efforts, it supplies materials and authentic facts for those who are interested in philosophical researches. The languages into which the Scriptures have been wholly or in part translated are nearly one hundred and fifty in number; and they are arranged under eight classes, *viz.*—1. Monosyllabic; 2. Shemitish; 3. Indo-European, which are subdivided into eight families; 4. detached families; 5. Polynesian, or Malayan; 6. African; 7. American; and 8. Mixed, or Patois languages. The portion before us comprises the first, or Monosyllabic languages, comprising the Chinese, Tibetan, Siamese, Burmese, Arakanese or Rukheng, Peguese, Talain or Mon, Karen, Munipoora, and Khassee. Under each language are given, in the following order, the geographical location and statistics of the nation into whose language the Scriptures have been translated; the characteristic features of the language, notice of the version in such language; and, finally, the results of the dissemination of each version. These various particulars are derived from authentic sources of information, which are cited in the notes. Ethnographical maps, compiled from the latest and best researches, will be occasionally given. This first part is illustrated with an ethnographical map of the countries in which the monosyllabic languages are spoken. The typographical execution of this truly valuable work is very neat. We shall probably recur to it on its completion.

A Letter to Lord John Russell, on Church Reform. By a Curate of the Diocese of Exeter. London: Painter. 1848.

The object of this pamphlet is, *inter alia*, to show how 70,000*l.* per annum may be obtained for supplying the wants of the

Church; and, among other means and appliances, the author suggests a graduated tax from one to eight per cent. on the income of all Church preferments, from 50*l.* to 800*l.* per annum, and ten per cent. on all above that sum. His views are clearly propounded; and, although we do not agree with him in some particulars, his pamphlet is worthy of the grave consideration of all whom it may concern, especially of those who have the power of applying the remedies suggested.

The author goes into other matters connected with the interests of the Church. He eulogizes in no measured terms the Premier's translation of Dr. Sumner to the see of Canterbury, as well as what the author is pleased to term his firmness in resisting the intolerant cry which was raised against Dr. Hampden. This savours a little too much of partisanship; and we do not quite understand what the author means by the "Orthodox Churches of the Dissenters." We were not aware of the existence of such things. Indeed, the designation appears to us to involve a contradiction in terms.

Original Thoughts on Various Passages of Scripture; being the Substance of Sermons preached by the late Rev. Richard Cecil, A.M., never before published. Taken down by some of his hearers, and now edited by CATHERINE CECIL. Seeleys. 1848.

OUR recollection supplies us with the names of very few pastors who have been regarded with warmer affection by their flocks while living, or have been remembered with greater reverence since their departure, than Richard Cecil; and his "Remains," which were published soon after he departed this life, have endeared his memory to numbers who were beyond the reach of his living ministry. For we know of more than one, and some of them who were themselves pastors, yet confessing with gratitude that their first apprehension of the spiritual import of many of the most prominent doctrines of the Gospel was to be ascribed, in a great degree, to the reflections which were suggested by a perusal of "Cecil's Remains."

Such facts furnish the best eulogy on a minister of Christ. But it is no trivial thing that the friend and successor of Cecil, the present Bishop of Calcutta, should have passed upon him so high an eulogium as is found in the published "Sermons and Tracts," I. 291:—"As a man, his talents were of no ordinary cast: as a Christian, all the fine materials which distinguish him as a man were brought up, if I might so say, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit: the leading feature of his character was faith." His humility, candour, self-command, and patience under affliction, are severally commended; and these were al

balanced and combined in the Christian minister, so as to account for the hold which he maintained to the very last on the understanding and hearts of his congregation.

The volume before us gives the substance of more than one hundred sermons, preached some of them as early as 1794, some of them as late as 1807, presenting a good picture of what was passing in Cecil's mind during those most eventful years; and the scenes of which now seem, as it were, to be acted over again before our eyes. Not that any of these sermons are political, or specially refer to the events which are taking place in the world; but that, under such trying circumstances, men especially need to have their faith strengthened; and need to remember continually that the Lord of Hosts ruleth among the inhabitants of the earth—that none can stay his hand from working, or say unto Him, What doest thou?

The substance of each sermon is given: some of them are very short—not more than four or five pages—therefore they give little idea of the style of Cecil. But from their simplicity most of them are very suitable for family reading, and each would suggest very profitable subjects of meditation during the day, or even furnish topics which might be enlarged and put into a more diffuse and popular form for the pulpit.

The volume consists of nearly seven hundred pages, and it has prefixed to it a very excellent portrait of Cecil himself.

The Gathering of Israel; or, the Patriarchal Blessing, as contained in the Forty-ninth Chapter of Genesis. By Aaron Pick, Author of "The Bible Student's Concordance." Nisbet. 1848.

Mr. Pick is, we believe, a baptized Jew—a class of men who have, at various times, rendered essential services to the Church by bringing Hebrew learning to bear upon the doctrines of the Gospel. But we must not expect too much from them: it is only in their own walk that they are mighty, and the knowledge of Hebrew which we derive from them has to be spiritualized and Christianized by those who have been trained and disciplined from childhood in the school of the Gospel; for Hebrew learning passes not beyond the letter of Scripture, while the Christian is expected on all occasions, habitually and instinctively, to look beyond the literal meaning of all present and visible things by that faith which is the substance of things hoped for and is the evidence of things not seen. The work before us treats of Jacob's dying predictions concerning his twelve sons. Mr. Pick shews in what manner these promises were fulfilled in the first settlements of the tribes of Israel in the land of Canaan; but we have been accustomed to view some of

the predictions as passing far beyond those times, and having regard to a future gathering of Israel at the second coming of Christ; and, therefore, in our eyes the first and partial fulfilment of these promises has very little interest in comparison with that which yet remains to be accomplished.

It is true that this future time is incidentally referred to in commenting on the difference between the names *Jacob* and *Israel.* But we believe that nearly all the prophecies of Ezekiel and very large portions of Isaiah and the minor prophets are yet unfulfilled: and necessarily so, for the simple reason that the most important part of the temple was never renewed. The ark, the tables of the law, the cherubim on the mercy seat, and all the contents of the most holy place, were destroyed at the taking of Jerusalem, by Nebuchadnezzar, and were wanting in the temple which was built after the return from Babylon: and even the sceptre of David could not properly be regarded as restored, seeing that the kingdom was ever after tributary to the kings of the East, or to the Romans.

The fulfilment which we have been accustomed to expect, even of the prophecy concerning Shiloh, is this—that the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet for ever, when Shiloh shall come; for to him shall the gathering of the people be—that is, Christ is the Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of the Everlasting Age, and Prince of Peace; and of the increase of his government and peace there shall then be no end, on the throne of David, to order and establish it thenceforth and for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts shall perform this (Isaiah ix. 7).

Baptism; or, the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church, scripturally illustrated and explained. By the Ven. C. J. Hoare, A.M., Archdeacon of Surrey. London: Hatchard and Son. 1848. 8vo.

This volume is a valuable accession to our popular theology, which we cordially commend to the attentive perusal of our readers generally, and especially to heads of families. The reverend author of it has treated a subject of no ordinary difficulty in a spirit so gentle and devout, and with so much judgment and discretion, that what in other hands might have proved a new apple of discord, now promises to be as oil cast upon the troubled waters.

Mr. Hoare takes his ground on the baptismal services of our Church, on which his volume is a full and continuous commentary. It is divided into three parts, corresponding to the three parts of the baptismal service—viz., "One *before*

baptism, one *at* the ceremony, and one *after* it." Each part is divided into sections of convenient length, so as to render the devout perusal of it profitable to the reader. The author has happily steered between that crude dogmatic teaching which makes the sacrament of baptism all but an *opus operatum*, and that laxity of interpretation which we have often had occasion to deplore in the course of our labours, and which would reduce this sacred ordinance to a mere naked ceremony. He has satisfactorily shown from the office of baptism that our Church teaches that a distinct blessing is conveyed by virtue of this ordinance; and he has successfully vindicated her application of the term "regeneration" to it. "A blessing" (it is truly remarked) "is prayed for, and the blessing is acknowledged as received. The covenant is opened, and she never more dares to close it to any human being. We have here her deliberate judgment on the point: and who shall venture to say, after so much care in her execution, and so much opportunity for knowledge and experience in her preparation of this service, that she has intimated either more or less than the truth of God in this matter; and this gathered from her only source of information or authority—the word of God?" (p. 105). In short, the work may be regarded as a practical illustration of that fine passage of St. Paul in Tit. iii. 5:— "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, He (God our Saviour) saved us by the washing of regeneration AND renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Hints on the Management of Female Parochial Schools. By a Clergyman's Wife. London: Hatchard. 1848.

THIS small but most valuable little book is introduced as the result of the practical experience of the writer in a country village, and it has the genuine stamp of experience. The views of the author are, to our notions, remarkably sound, and expounded in the clearest possible language, while a kind and gentle spirit breathes throughout this useful little manual.

A Letter Addressed to the Church, by a Member of the Church of England, on the Holy Mystery of the "First Resurrection, the Day of the Restoration of the Kingdom of Israel."

THE lengthy title of this boarded pamphlet, of some seventy pages, will explain its object: the greater portion of the volume consists of texts of Scripture bearing upon the author's views. This has reached us so late that we cannot afford to it a more particular notice.

Fifty-two Sermons adapted to each Sunday in the Year, and designed more especially to trace and explain the Connection between the Doctrines, Duties, and Consolations of Religion. By the Rev. JEREMIAH SMITH, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1848. 8vo.

THE title-page of this volume accurately states its object. The subject of each sermon is founded on some important thought, contained in the collect, epistle, and gospel, for each Sunday and holiday in the ecclesiastical year; and the several discourses, which are truly practical, are so arranged as to exhibit an exposition of the leading articles of our Christian faith, the rules of our duty, and the sources of our consolation. We think this volume well adapted to private and family reading.

The Revolutions of 1848. *A Re-commencement of the Judgments upon the Papacy.* By CHARLES RICHARD CAMERON, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, Rector of Swaby, Lincolnshire, Author of "The Antichrist of St. John." London: Painter.

THE object of this publication is succinctly propounded in the prefix to the introduction, in which the Revolutions of 1848 are designated "a re-commencement of the judgments upon the Papacy, suspended on the pouring out of the sixth vial, and after the loosing of Satan out of his prison, founded on the synchronisms of Mede, and anticipated in the writings of his followers." It in fact, purposes to show the connection of the present convulsions of Europe with the apocalyptic predictions; and, without venturing to pronounce on the views entertained by the author, we regard the theory propounded as one of great interest to all, and they are many, who devote their attention to the subject.

Defects in the Practice of Life Assurance, and Suggestions for their Remedy. London: Orr, 1848.

THIS is a very *one-sided* affair: it lays it down as a principle that no assurance office should dispute a claim, and holds up to obloquy, and by name, the offices which have appealed to a court of law against what they conceived to be a fraud upon their funds. The instances quoted are few, as well they may be, inasmuch as the directors of these establishments know well enough that they lose more by contesting a claim than by paying it without dispute. The author alleges—what, by the way, is not the fact—that offices have the means of detecting fraudulent intention before granting a policy; and that, consequently, if they grant one without using those means, the fault is theirs, and they have no right to open the question afterwards. On this principle, half the offences against the law

would pass unpunished. We have the means of preventing our pockets from being picked by constantly keeping our hands upon them; and, therefore, forsooth, it is our own fault if we lose our purse. Some persons, however, are of a different opinion; and, at the hazard of being denounced by such theorists as the author, prosecute the thief, gaining as little by the process as do assurance offices in disputing a claim. Policies are granted mainly on the assumption of good faith on the part of those whose evidence is appealed to by the proposer of the assurance; and, if those referees play false, what means have offices of protecting themselves from the fraud? An office has recently been established professing to pay all policies granted by them, without dispute, no matter on what false representations they were issued. Of course, the pamphlet before us does not stand to this office in the relation of effect to cause—we only remark on the coincidence. The author's practical knowledge of the subject on which he writes will be measured by his statement that, in the case of every proposal for assurance, two hundred questions, as to the health of the individual, are generally propounded and answered. We speak advisedly when we say that, in no one instance, do they, or can they, amount to one-fourth of that number.

Matutina: Morning Readings, Selected and Original, Chiefly Practical, and adapted to the Use of the Younger Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. G. Renaud, M.A. Longmans. 1848.

This volume arose out of a want experienced by the author, and we may say very generally felt, of a book to be always at hand suggesting a profitable subject of thought, for each day in the year, yet so concise as not break in upon the time of the most busy, while the subjects should yet have sufficient point and variety to engage the attention. Each subject is so short as seldom to fill more than a page, and the authors from whom the selections are made exceed sixty in number, without including the contributions of anonymous friends. We give one of the shortest as an illustration:—

"Jan. 3.—I have set the Lord always before me (Psalms xvi. 8). It is said we cannot be always thinking of God; and, if so, how can a sense of his presence continually bear upon our most intimate actions and concerns? To this I answer, that a person at court is not always thinking of the king. Nevertheless, there is an abiding though insensible impression upon his mind where he is and before whom he stands, so unerring and so effectual to every practical purpose as to declare, with infallible certainty, that nothing will be done to violate the laws of the most strict decorum. And so it is with the man who sets the Lord always before him."

Presbytery Examined: an Essay Critical and Historical on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation. By the Duke of ARGYLL. Moxon. 1848.

THIS is an able and temperate vindication of the Presbyterianism of Scotland, intended to show that, from the circumstances of the times and the course of events, there remained no alternative; since that Episcopacy had become either a mere instrument for crushing the Reformation, and bringing all who professed its doctrines to the stake as seen in the Roman hierarchy; or that it had become gross and open simony, misappropriating and squandering the revenues of the Church, in those who called themselves Protestant bishops; until, at length, "in 1580, in full assembly, the royal commissioner being present, an unanimous vote was carried that the name and office of bishop was abolished in the Church of Scotland; and such was the power of that great council, and so fully did it express the public sentiment, that the submission of the whole order, with the exception of five individuals, was given in before the close of the year" (78). The history of all the preceding steps which led to this decisive act are given with great clearness in the first part of the volume. John Knox had taken the lead in propagating the doctrines of the Reformation, and by his indomitable energy and courage had kept his countrymen from despondency, though their Queen, leagued with France, "was exclusively under the guidance of the most unprincipled supporters of the Papacy, and French troops had disembarked on the shores of Scotland to suppress her liberty and religion" (20). It was in this extremity that the lords of the congregation concluded the treaty of Berwick with Elizabeth; and the arrival of the English fleet and army, probably, saved Scotland many years of misery and bloodshed, and produced the great final settlement in June, 1560, by which it was stipulated that the foreign troops on both sides should be immediately withdrawn and a free Parliament should be forthwith assembled; and, by this treaty, the reformed religion was virtually established in Scotland.

The Estates met in Edinburgh on the 1st of August, in the same year. "The lords spiritual and temporal, the high peers and prelates of the realm, barons great and small, burgesses and ministers, all were there;" but no message or commission from the Queen had arrived. This, however, did not stop them: the insignia of royalty were brought in state into the hall and placed upon the vacant throne; and, having previously voted themselves a lawful assembly in virtue of the treaty, they adopted that confession of faith which the reformed ministers had been

instructed to prepare: and they also passed Acts which made it penal to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, or even conform to the practices of the Romanists. Some of these were very severe—"the penalties prescribed against the celebration of mass included, in the last instance, the punishment of death" —severities which have been glossed over by succeeding historians under the general designation of "certain penalties;" but which were thought the least that could be inflicted by men who regarded the mass as actual idolatry, and whose minds were ever filled with the terrible denunciations in the Old Testament against all who were found guilty of partaking in, or conniving at, such a crime. Fourteen years before, they had witnessed the burning alive of George Wishart at the gate of the archiepiscopal palace, and the bloody retribution on Cardinal Beatoun within a fortnight after he had perpetrated that murder of a man whose only offence was that he professed the reformed faith. The reformers all felt that their own lives were at stake; and no wonder is it that, in those stern and ferocious times, they should insist on subjecting their opponents to the same venture.

They, at the same time, commenced the formation of that scheme of ecclesiastical polity which we find embodied in the first and second Books of Discipline—an undertaking in which they were novices, and in which they reckoned too much on finding other men's minds embued with those principles of Church government which were predominant in their own spirits. However, they laid some foundations at that time which remain to the present day; and the principles which they asserted furnish the best clue to guide an Englishman through the perplexing and seemingly ferocious controversies which have harrassed and divided Scotland to so remarkable an extent. We could not expect our readers to feel a general interest in our pursuit of this subject to a greater length; and, to such as may feel interested therein, nothing which we could say would prove half so satisfactory as a reference to the volume itself, which is, what it professes to be, a critical and historical examination of the grounds on which the Presbyterianism of Scotland rests, and which we can assure them is very ably written, and very temperately and fairly argued. The history is divided into six periods —from 1560 to 1584; 1584 to 1592; 1592 to 1603; 1603 to 1638; 1638 to 1660; 1660 to 1688—which division is not arbitrary, for each of these dates represents some crisis in the affairs of Scotland; and they form also the regular alternate steps which mark the successive triumph and depression of her distinctive principles: they are epochs in one long determined struggle between two great rival systems:—

"With these transactions (those of 1560) we have entered the first of those periods into which we have divided the ecclesiastical history of Scotland since the Reformation; and already are seen appearing almost all the tendencies which form the key to the course of subsequent events. The facts ecclesiastical and the facts political are seen assuming the form which, under certain modifications and temporary changes, will be found substantially characterising them throughout the history. The contest which began, in 1560, between her reformed subjects and Mary Queen of Scots, is essentially the same as that which terminated in 1688, in the expulsion of her great-grandson from the throne of Britain. The same cause which operated in the time of Mary Stewart continued to operate as long as the Stewarts reigned—an irreconcileable hostility between the rights of the governed and the principles of the governor. And to us, we confess, the conduct of Mary is infinitely more defensible than the conduct of her children. The whole width between a bigoted Popery and a hardly less bigoted Protestantism lay between her and a wise and just dealing with her subjects.....We cannot say all this for her successors" (25).

The noble author having traced the history of the Presbyterians until they had obtained the ascendancy in Scotland, and had their creed recognized as the Established Church of that land, proceeds in the second part of the volume to apply the lessons of history to existing circumstances and present times:—

"But why, it may be asked, have thus gone over again the fierce battles of the covenant, and retraced the long contests between presbytery and prelacy in Scotland? Because they are living parties—because they are fighting now—because, with all the hereditary features of their character, they still stand opposed as they stood of yore. Presbytery has not lost its wild wayward vigour: it is marked with the same rugged virtues: in excess, it tends to the same vices of opinions. Prelacy has not abated its narrow bigotry: it is incited by the same grasping ambition to be national: its opinions tend to the same sacerdotal usurpations. The divine right of bishops is still the central point in the theology of the one—the 'crown of Christ' is still extravagantly quoted in the system of the other: they are both things of the present day. It is well that we should know what is to be hoped or feared from each; and, in order to anticipate their future, we must understand their past" (219).

The Duke of Argyll is a Presbyterian, and therefore looks with something more than our own abhorrence upon prelacy, seeing that we belong to an Episcopalian Establishment; but we go along with all those, whether Presbyterian or Episcopalian, who protest against that caricature of Episcopacy which has been exhibited in the Oxford party and Camden Society in England, and the Spottiswoode Society in Scotland; and, of course, we entirely agree with the Duke of Argyle in all that is

said of the most absurd and illogical stuff which has been put forth by the "Free Church" party concerning the "Headship of Christ;" which has just as much to do with the question as Tenterden Steeple had to do with the Goodwin Sands.

It is curious to observe how extremes meet: the powers claimed by the Church of Rome are precisely those which are claimed by the "Free Church" of Scotland, and, what is still more extraordinary, are supported by precisely the same texts of Scripture. We may hear Presbyterian assemblies designating the power they claim as the "power of the keys," and we may hear them quoting in support of it the same texts which have always been the favourite texts of priests. We may find, for instance, that the first text quoted by the "Free Church" in support of Presbyterian claims is likewise the favourite text of Rome. Who that has visited Italy does not remember that great circle from which the glorious dome of St. Peter's rises, and on which is inscribed in letters of gold, "Tu es Petrus," &c. This, too, is the text first and prominently quoted by the "Constitutional Catechism" of the Free Church in support of its dogma of the absolute and sacred distinctions and separation to be maintained between civil and spiritual power.

We have often pointed out the necessity of making the proper distinctions between Episcopacy and Prelacy, and they certainly become more and more important every day. Christ combines in his single Person the offices of king and priest —in no other single person are both the offices combined: they were not combined under the old dispensation, but stood in Moses and Aaron—in kings and the successors of Aaron in the high priesthood; and, under the Christian dispensation, a further distinction subsists, in that Christ is ascended to heaven and there exercises his offices of King and Priest: there alone is it seen in unity or the fullness of its exercise. And as surely as the priestly authority is delegated to his Church by our High Priest in the heavens, so surely is the regal authority delegated to the kings of the earth by him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. By the same word which enjoins us to fear God we are also enjoined to honour the king; and, again—Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God.....Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.

London: W. E. Painter, Church and State Gazette Office, 342, Strand.